

ID #	Comment Date	Commenter Name / Agency	Comment	Final Proponent Response
1	2017-02-07	Antonia Mills - Prince George	People in Digby Island region are greatly concerned about the environmental and human health impacts of the Aurora LNG project because Nexen is proposing to dredge and alter a large portion of the Delusion Bay habitat for their loading trestle. This project could have impacts to Skeena Salmon similar to those posed by Pacific North West LNG at Flora Bank. Dr. Barb Faggetter assigned a habitat value to the Delusion Bay area equal to that of Flora Bank. Studies being carried out in the area have shown significant numbers of juvenile salmon. The project is also very close to the community of Digby Island. A proper Environmental Review would note that the salmon need protection.	Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the environmental assessment application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss.
2	2017-02-07	Christopher Travis - California	The proposed LNG terminal will hamper the migration of salmon and steelhead up the Skeena River. Any encroachment on Digby Island will have a deleterious affect on spawning salmon and also growth of juvenile salmon and steelhead. Please utilize other ports where LNG sights have already been built.....like Vancouver.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
3	2017-02-07	Howard Kirkham - Victoria	Here are the three numbers that should not be forgotten: 1. 2 degrees — Almost every government in the world has agreed that any warming above a 2°C (3.6°F) rise would be unsafe. We have already raised the temperature .8°C, and that has caused far more damage than most scientists expected. A third of summer sea ice in the Arctic is gone, the oceans are 30 percent more acidic, and since warm air holds more water vapor than cold, the climate dice are loaded for increasing both devastating floods and drought. 2. 565 gigatons — Scientists estimate that humans can pour roughly 565 more gigatons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and still have some reasonable hope of staying below two degrees. Computer models calculate that even if we stopped increasing CO2 levels now, the temperature would still rise another 0.8 degrees above the 0.8 we've already warmed, which means that we're already 3/4s of the way to the 2 degree target. 3. 2,795 gigatons — The Carbon Tracker Initiative, a team of London financial analysts, estimates that proven coal, oil, and gas reserves of the fossil-fuel companies, and the countries (think Venezuela or Kuwait) that act like fossil-fuel companies, equals about 2,795 gigatons of CO2, or five times the amount we can release to maintain 2 degrees of warming. It is time to connect the dots between climate change, politics, and the fossil fuel industry. The LNG development on Digby Island is is an example of a time when politics, ideology, or economics need to submit to the math and physics of climate change; otherwise we need to prepare for some awkward future questions from our children and grand-children. I am calling upon my country, Canada via the Environmental Assessment Office, to become a model for the world and reject the application for the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
4	2017-02-07	Personal Information Withheld - Salmon Arm	I am opposed to the Aurora LNG project for Digby Island due to its extreme endangerment of Pacific Coast wild Salmon stock, and an important natural resource that provides good jobs in the fishing industry. Although I live away, I have been actively protecting our B.C. natural environment for 63 years.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
5	2017-02-07	Personal Information Withheld - West Vancouver	This is yet another climate destroying outrage by this incompetent government. Reject this project and the government with it.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
6	2017-02-07	John Stevens - Delta	I am a commercial fisherman of 50 years experience and I am concerned that Aurora will have a negative environmental impact on Delusion Bay. Also, I feel that all export of B.C.'s LNG should not be allowed to proceed in view of the fact that most of the LNG will be extracted by fracking. I believe that fracking has an unacceptable carbon footprint on our planet and must be stopped in order to meet Canada's goal in support of the Paris Agreement and the movement to reverse global warming.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
7	2017-02-07	Per-Henrik Norman - Kitimat	In the event the project proceeds and it is acceptable to the residents of Dodge Cove, that the proponent pays for relocation of the community to another preferred location within PR harbour, if it exists.	Aurora LNG acknowledges the comment.
8	2017-02-07	Josh Wainwright - Kentucky	The LNG proposa is a potential environmental disaster. But you know that. Please don't give in to Greed. This Planet is all we have!!k	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
9	2017-02-07	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert	I would like to see this project go ahead. I support development on digby island.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
10	2017-02-01	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert	I am in total support of this project. Prince Rupert needs some industry setting up here. As a small business owner I see the value, and look forward to a positive decision.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
11	2017-01-29	Luke Wallace - Vancouver/Digby Island	Dear EAO and whomever else this may concern, I am utterly appalled and disappointment in the local, provincial and federal governments for allowing the proposed Aurora Fracked Gas terminal to get as far as it has. This project has already significantly disrupted and put at risk one of the most beautiful and balanced communities along the west coast. The residents of Digby Island have been entirely ignored in the consultation process, as is true in every community speaking out against the expansion of fracking and export terminals along the west coast. This project is a terrible idea in all meanings of the word, except that it keeps with the promises made by The BC Liberals to their corporate funders during the last election. The Aurora Fracked Gas Terminal disregards the irreversible impacts it will have on the local community and ecosystems, including the residents of Dodge Cove. It completely ignores the detrimental impacts that fracking is having on indigenous communities in the north-east corner of B C. It is a dagger in the heart of young folks like me who are holding on to that last piece of hope that we may see our lives through without a global climate collapse. We cannot afford to burn another ounce of oil or gas. I will repeat that. We cannot afford to burn another ounce of oil or gas. Please recognize that constructing this project would be equivalent to waging war on the residents of this coast and we will respond firmly but peacefully to ensure that our coast and planet remain healthy for your children and grandchildren. Grow a spine and say something. To whomever is reading this - you have more power than the average person. Use it.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

12	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <p>1) It seems as if no Canadian regulations were set on the safety of LNG tankers and terminals before Nexen-CNOOC* got their export permit and their invitation from the Provincial Government and Prince Rupert Harbour Authority to locate here. When I was concerned about navigation at the narrow entrance to the harbour and at the terminal site on Digby Island, I was told by a Nexen representative not to worry as they had been meeting with Transport Canada. The births for docking and loading vessels are too close to marine traffic entering into the Prince Rupert Inner Harbour because they put all traffic in a hazard zone- BC ferries, smaller local ferries, all fisherman, all recreation boats and all carriers travelling to the Fairview Container Port. Here is a direct quote from SIGTTO (see note at bottom)....LNG ports must be located where LNG vapours from a spill or release cannot affect civilians.  * LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses...  * The hazard zone is meant to be clear of other boats and people while loading or travelling.  * The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators' Siting Standards  * China's National Offshore Oil Corporation</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.</p>
13	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <p>2) Studies have not been done to see how the disturbance of the muskeg will affect our muskeg ponds and our water drainage that feeds our community dam. Our dam supplies all the community's water, drinking water as well and the studies of possible contamination are essentially non-existent.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG recognizes the importance of healthy watersheds and water quality. Potential effects to water quality were assessed in Section 4.5 of the Application. Drainage basins for all of Digby Island have been delineated using high resolution topographic imagery. These basins will be assessed for potential effects prior to final site design and layout.</p> <p>An assessment of the potential effects of Project emissions included the modelling of potential acidification and eutrophication effects on fresh water quality, vegetation and wetland receptors. The Dodge Cove Community Watershed was included as a receptor in the water quality assessment. In all, 27 mitigation measures are identified in the Application for implementation to reduce potential impacts to water quality, including measures outlined in the air quality assessment.</p>
14	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <p>3) The destruction of wildlife due to the disruption of their homes, feeding and breeding territories. These would be all species of migratory birds and the resident flocks of great blue heron, bald eagle, Canada goose and many other waterfowl as well as one wolf pack. We will never know the numbers of migrating flocks that use Delusion Bay as to my knowledge no studies have ever been done.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>The Wildlife Resources (Terrestrial) and Marine Birds technical data reports (Appendix J and Q of the Application) provide information on the studies undertaken by Aurora LNG to characterize which bird species are present within the Project Development Area (PDA) and potentially affected by Project activities. Birds (including Canada geese, bald eagle, great blue heron, waterfowl, and other migratory species) use of habitats in Delusion Bay and surrounding areas are discussed in these reports. Section 4.7.5 of the Application describes potential effects to change in breeding, foraging, staging, and overwintering habitat for wildlife, including wolves and bird species present on Digby Island.</p> <p>To provide context for wildlife protection measures proposed by Aurora LNG, Sections 4.7.2.1 and 4.11.2.1 of the Application outline 11 key pieces of legislation, policy, and regulatory guidance from both the provincial and federal governments regarding terrestrial wildlife and marine bird species that Aurora LNG will comply with. In addition, more than 20 different mitigation measures are outlined in the Application; Aurora LNG intends to implement these measures to reduce potential effects to terrestrial wildlife and marine bird habitat, mortality risk, movement, and behaviour.</p> <p>Example mitigation measures include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A 30 metre vegetated buffer along the coast will be maintained to reduce the amount of habitat removed or altered.</li> <li>2) Clearly delineating and flagging the approved clearing boundaries within the PDA prior to site preparation activities to reduce the potential for accidental clearing and habitat loss beyond the PDA.</li> <li>3) Avoiding clearing within the breeding season for birds, amphibians, and bats to reduce disturbance to reproducing individuals and their habitats.</li> <li>4) A Wetland Compensation Plan will be implemented to meet Environment Canada requirements of no net loss of ecologically important wetland functions.</li> </ol>

15 (1 of 2)	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <p>4) The dredging of the ocean bed near the planned berths and the possible sea bed explosions. This will affect not only the marine life on the sea bed but the marine life breeding and traveling in that general area, being dependent on the Skeena River estuary food chain. These include harbour porpoise, orcas and humpback whales, seals, sea lions as well as the many species of salmon in and around the Skeena River Estuary. Dredging will also affect the eel grass, salmon habitat found near Digby Island. The top 0.5 m of dredged material, 76,400 m3 is expected to be disposed of on our island because it has the highest concentrations of COPC contaminants. The remaining 450,000 m3 is expected to be disposed of, probably in Brown's Passage at sea.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. While Aurora LNG recognizes that effects on all quality of life attributes are difficult to accurately measure and evaluate; or effectively mitigate to the satisfaction of Dodge Cove residents, Aurora LNG Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. Aurora LNG is aware of Dodge Cove's concerns related to the proximity of the proposed access road to the community and its water supply. To address these concerns, Aurora LNG has revised the corridor for the proposed access road to shift the proposed road to the west side of an elevated ridge and outside of the watershed that drains into the Dodge Cove drinking water supply. At its closest point, the modified access road is approximately 550 meters from Dodge Cove with trees and an elevated ridge between the proposed road and the community (the original access road was approximately 200 meters from Dodge Cove). The shift to the west will mitigate concerns regarding potential effects on the drinking water supply and the increased distance along with the elevated ridge and treed area will mitigate potential effects of road dust and vehicle noise to residents of Dodge Cove. (For more information regarding potential effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water supply and a map of the modified access road, refer to the "Dodge Cove Water Supply and Watershed" technical memo, which will be filed with the EAO).</p> <p>The importance of, and concerns related to, dredging and underwater blasting are reflected in the Application and undergo lengthy consideration. Effects of dredging on fish and fish habitat are considered at various locations in Section 4.9. Specifically, for marine fish (including Pacific salmon) and fish habitat (including eelgrass), change in habitat; pages 4.9-46 to 4.9-49, change in behaviour; pages 4.9-69 to 4.9-70, change in mortality risk; pages 4.9-87 to 4.9-88, change in health: pages 4.9-101 to 4.9-104. Effects on marine water quality are considered at length on pages 4.5-67 to 4.5-78, while effects on marine mammals are considered on pages 4.10-51 and 4.10-57 - 4.10-58. Likewise, the potential effects of underwater blasting are duly considered throughout the Application, again reflecting concern associated with this activity. Specifically; marine mammals: pages 4.10-45 to 4.10-46 and 4.10-58 to 4.10-59, marine fish (including Pacific salmon) and fish habitat (including eelgrass); pages 4.9-72 to 4.9-73, 4.9-89 to 4.9-90</p> <p>The sediment mobilization effects of in-water blasting are also considered in Section 4.5.12. Please note that the effects of dredging (primarily via the re-suspension of sediment) and blasting (primarily via the production of underwater pressure waves and sound) are widely appreciated and, consequently, standard mitigations and best management practices exist to reduce and manage these potential effects. Aurora LNG is committed to implementing these mitigations and practices, as detailed in the Application.</p> <p>The top 0.5 m of sediment contains concentrations of dioxins and furans (PCDD/F) that may render it unsuitable for disposal at a dispersive ocean site. However, these PCDD/F concentrations do not indicate a level that would constitute contamination, and do not pose a risk to humans or wildlife if the sediment is disposed of on land.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
15 (2 of 2)	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Consider the following;</p> <p>1) The maximum concentration of PCDD/F in the sediment was 2.86 picograms per gram of sediment, based on fish toxic equivalency (pg-TEQ/g). The Disposal at Sea guideline for PCDD/F is 9 pg-TEQ/g. Sediments meet the criteria for disposal at sea. However, sediments cannot be disposed at the proposed location of Brown Passage because the disposal site is classified as "dispersive"; while the guideline applies to "non-dispersive" sites. (ref=<a href="http://ceqg-rcqe.come.ca/download/en/245">http://ceqg-rcqe.come.ca/download/en/245</a> and references therein.)</p> <p>2) The BC Contaminated Sites Regulations for PCDD/Fs in sediment for marine and estuarine waters are: Sensitive Contaminated Site - 130 pg-TEQ/g; Typical Contaminated Site - 260 pg-TEQ/g. (ref=<a href="http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-water/site-remediation/docs/policies-and-standards/sed_criteria_tech_app.pdf">http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-water/site-remediation/docs/policies-and-standards/sed_criteria_tech_app.pdf</a>)</p> <p>3) When sediments are disposed on land, they are managed as soils. The BC Contaminated Sites Regulations for PCDD/Fs in soil are; Agricultural/Parkland/Residential Land - 350 pg-TEQ/g; Commercial Land Use - 1,000 pg-TEQ/g; Industrial Land Use - 70,000 pg-TEQ/g. (ref=<a href="http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/375_96_07">http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/375_96_07</a>)</p> <p>4) The BC Contaminated Sites Regulations - Schedule 7 for soil relocation to non-agricultural land for PCDD/Fs are; 350 pg-TEQ/g. (ref=<a href="http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/loo78/loo78/375_96_09">http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/loo78/loo78/375_96_09</a>)</p> <p>5) The Canadian Food Inspection Agency dioxin limit for all fish products is 20 parts per trillion (ppt), measured as TEQ. In comparison, the dioxin concentrations in sampled marine foods were; Dungeness crab meat - 0.273 ppt, Dungeness crab hepatopancreas - 1.4 ppt, Clam - 0.811 ppt. (ref=<a href="http://www.inspection.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-food-aliments/STAGING/text-texte/fish_man_standardsmethods_appendix3_1406403090196_eng.pdf">http://www.inspection.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-food-aliments/STAGING/text-texte/fish_man_standardsmethods_appendix3_1406403090196_eng.pdf</a>)</p>
16	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <p>5) The destruction of the land and creeks around Delusion Bay, the dumping of the site's topsoil next to the water, means the disruption of all the wildlife such as otter, weasel, amphibians and marine species dependent on the inlet for their habitat and food. This dumping would effectively suffocate all the life: animals and plants in this location and destroy nesting sites. This is the centre island habitat with Delusion Bay running into the middle like an inlet. This flyway for winter birds is essentially the undisturbed wilderness of Digby Island.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>There are 11 different pieces of legislation, policy and regulatory guidance from both the provincial and federal governments that Aurora LNG will fully comply with regarding terrestrial wildlife. In addition, there are 23 different mitigation measures outlined in the Application that Aurora LNG intends to implement to reduce potential effects to terrestrial wildlife habitat, mortality risk and movement. Some of these mitigations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» A 30 metre vegetated buffer along the coast will be maintained to reduce the amount of habitat removed or altered.</li> <li>» Clearly delineating and flagging the approved clearing boundaries within the project development area (PDA) prior to site preparation activities to reduce the potential for accidental clearing and habitat loss beyond the PDA.</li> <li>» A Wetland Compensation Plan will be implemented to meet Environment Canada requirements of no net loss of ecologically important wetland functions.</li> </ul>

17	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock. Here are my concerns: 6) Once the construction begins the community will be harassed by the noise. Two compressors within approximately .5 km. south of our properties are comparable to eight 747 Boeing Jet Engines. A floating hotel for project workers will also be built closer than the PDA (project borders) in Casey Cove which borders on our green space. Our beach has a low gradient and low tide makes it available for all kinds of life and human recreation. Traditionally the Dodge Cove Recreation Society has held an annual Canada Day Celebration at their campfire location. The view has always been the historic Marine Station that is now being torn down as Nexen-CNOOC has bought a few acres for water access.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.
18	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock. Here are my concerns: 7) The planned paved road to the airport access road (north island), would cut through the heart of our community, overlap our Official Community Plan. It would cut us off from Lake Wahl and our winter recreation, named after the famous Wahl family of boatbuilders. As the industrial project and its pollution cuts to the quick of the island it also cuts the heart of our culture and quality of life.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
19	2017-01-29	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	I am writing in regards to the Nexen LNG Terminal "Aurora" project which has been planned for our Digby Island. I have lived on this island for 25 years in the small community of Dodge Cove which is most affected by the planned industry in proximity of less than 0.5 km. to our residents' property lines. We have always prided our semi-isolated location and privacy on the edge of the wilderness although we do share the island with the local airport and another cove settlement called Crippen Cove. We use the wilderness lightly, wanting to leave little trace of our passage, but at the same time this island has become imbedded in the psyche of any resident ever spending any years on this island. Many of us feel like the anonymous stewards of this land and therefore when such a large industrial complex, literally lands on our doorstep, our Official Community Plan and our watershed, we are definitely left in shock. I am asking that the Provincial Government adhere to world class standards, as researched at Sandia Labs in the U.S. as stated in The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators' terminal siting standards. The US department of Energy has defined 3 Hazard Zones. The ships and operations* should be at least 2.2 miles from citizens. I have determined their closest ship berth to the south end of Digby Island is under 1.5 miles. The main navigation route in the harbour is within this hazard zone. You can understand why our community is very concerned as we sit within the first zone where the gas is liquefied, where if there is a malfunction, one spark will incinerate all life. The International Standards (world class) that do exist are not being followed as Premier Clark has promised. Steps must be taken to address these serious faults in LNG Terminal Plans before an Environmental Assessment is determined and construction begun.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.
20	2017-01-28	Vicki Harper - Smithers	No thank you	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
21	2017-01-27	Personal Information Withheld - Delta	My close family live in Dodge Cove and will likely be forced to relocate from their pristine environment due to degradation due to noise, increased air and boat traffic and their very livelihood being threatened. Please consider their urgent requests to cancel the planned location of the LNG project.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
22	2017-01-27	Louise Taylor - Pemberton	Dear Sean, RE: public comment proposed Aurora LNG project Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Aurora LNG project, which is yet another project that will exacerbate climate change and for that reason alone should not be approved. This project will ensure that BC will fail to meet its GHG emissions reduction targets which it is legally required to do under both domestic and international law. Persons who believe that LNG is "green" energy need their head examined. Other reasons to not approve this project include: 1. The residents' lives of Dodge Cove will be negatively impacted by this project and siting it so close to the community violates international siting standards which stipulate that such projects be located away from population centres and other marine traffic. 2. Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. 3. Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island. Stop wasting tax payers' money on this project and other climate change exacerbating projects which should NEVER be considered at this time. Climate change is here and real. We need to support energy conservation, household solar power and energy efficient buildings not LNG projects which are killing life on earth and will be stranded assets in the very near future. Please feel free to publish my comments. Best regards,	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
23	2017-01-26	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert	This project will make the inhabitants of the Digby Island and surrounding area ( my relatives) unable to live their lives in a natural green space environment. It will devalue their homes and make them un-sellable if they choose to leave. This is madness, not good and responsible government!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
24	2017-01-26	Personal Information Withheld - Toronto	A colleague of mine currently visiting Guatemala wrote to me today about the incredible tragedies of numerous families being forced off their land to make room for mining developments. I wish I could say that this is not an issue in Canada but, as we can see with the proposed LNG placement, these tragedies are a reality here too. Regardless of social class, any forceful removal of families off of their land and home is a human tragedy. I have yet to see any credible reasoning for why the LNG needs to be built there specifically. Of course, it shouldn't be built at all, but perhaps that is a different issue. I strongly disagree with this project, and, although I am currently not residing in the area, I know that many individuals from Prince Rupert will be very active in their support for the families of Digby Island, and I encourage that their voices be heard seriously.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

25	2017-01-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I have concerns about the impact that the Aurora LNG terminal would have on the tourism industry in Prince Rupert and the surrounding area. On <a href="http://www.lonelyplanet.com/canada/british-columbia/prince-rupert">www.lonelyplanet.com/canada/british-columbia/prince-rupert</a>, Lonely Planet online, Prince Rupert has a good report for tourism. "People are always "discovering" Prince Rupert and realizing what a find it is....this intriguing city with a gorgeous harbour is not just a transportation hub for ferries...it is a destination in its' own right."</p> <p>In comparison, Gladstone Australia (where LNG terminals have been constructed) does NOT. "Unless you've got an industry fetish, Gladstone, with its busy port, power station and alumina refineries, is rather uninspiring. Prince Rupert has been trying to attract MORE cruise ships and tourism here, not less. Situating an LNG terminal in a hazardous location at the mouth of Prince Rupert harbour where all ships need to pass through will not help. The 2017 season already has 25 cruise ships scheduled on top of the existing tourism that the BC Ferries bring through. Prince Rupert Terminals Inc. has stated that the plan is to attract more high-end cruise lines. "Arriving into port by ship is breathtaking, as you skirt hundreds of islands and make your way through narrow, mist-shrouded passageways to this town..if it's wildlife you seek, Prince Rupert is a dream location, home to Canada's only Grizzly Bear Sanctuary, the highest concentration of humpbacked whales in North America, white Kermode bears and soaring eagles. Your visit will leave you with a greater appreciation for the interaction between man and the natural world." <a href="http://www.cruisecritic.com/ports/newport.cfm?ID=136">http://www.cruisecritic.com/ports/newport.cfm?ID=136</a></p> <p>Also the economic impacts of tourism and the wide-ranging effects that Aurora LNG will have on the North have not been properly assessed. We know that the salmon that funnel through the Skeena River Estuary distribute themselves in a wide-ranging area - as well as support tourism up and down the Skeena. Tourists come here to see all the marine and land animals - which are intricately dependent on the present food webs, of which the salmon is a major part. Ocean-based industries directly employ 10% of people and 20% indirectly here in the North. Many people outside of the North also come here to be employed in ocean-based industries.</p> <p>Tourism in BC is a 5.9 BILLION dollar industry - in the North billions of tourist dollars are created, much of which stays here. A MULTI-BILLION dollar industry that WILL be impacted by the site location of Aurora LNG. And that has NOT been assessed. (Pictured attached of tourists whale watching with Adventure Tours) <a href="http://www.bcbc.com/content/558/2020_200910_Mansfield_Tourism.pdf">http://www.bcbc.com/content/558/2020_200910_Mansfield_Tourism.pdf</a></p> <p>The Aurora LNG application looks minimally at local areas and effects, and minimally looks at local economy but does not assess the wide-ranging implications that situating this project in the Skeena Estuary could have for the North and North Coast tourism sectors.</p>	<p>The potential effects of the proposed Aurora LNG project on tourism are addressed in Section 6.5 of the Application. Specifically, Section 6.5.5.1 focuses on how LNG carrier traffic associated with the operation of the Project might affect fisheries, recreation or tourism sites.</p> <p>From 2010 to 2015, Prince Rupert was second busiest port in the province, with large vessel traffic increasing from 548 visits to 628 visits. The assessment estimates the project will contribute approximately 8.4% of the total annual large vessel traffic to the region at full build-out. With implementation of mitigation measures and by adhering to national and international maritime laws and regulations, the effects of the project on marine use and navigable waters are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>Recreational and tourism sites, including anchorages, coast campsites, marinas, and scuba diving areas are located throughout the LAA and RAA and most will not be affected by Project-related shipping, while many recreational boating routes hug the coast, with only limited overlap with Project shipping (see Figure 6.5-13). While some sites or boating routes overlap the shipping route (e.g., near Triple Island and at the mouth of Prince Rupert harbour), safety and access to all recreation or tourism sites and routes will be maintained with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. For example, recreational and tourism operators will have access to real-time ship traffic information (e.g., from the MCTS) that can be used to anticipate vessel movements along the shipping route. Moreover, because shipping has occurred along the shipping route for decades, it is expected that eco-tour operators and recreational mariners will be accustomed to navigating around large vessel traffic, and in consideration of the proposed mitigation measures, two large vessel transits per day associated with the Project will not reduce access to the sites located along the shipping route. In consideration of the mitigation measures that will be in place and experience of mariners in the Prince Rupert region (with respect to marine navigation in the presence of shipping traffic), potential effects on marine recreation and tourism from shipping traffic are predicted to be low magnitude.</p>
26	2017-01-22	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert	<p>I am concerned that the location of the Aurora LNG terminal is too close to the community of Dodge Cove and too close to the Prince Rupert Airport. I understand that the international standard is that LNG terminals should not be located within 15 kilometers of a community, but the Aurora terminal is barely 3 kilometers away from Dodge Cove.</p> <p>Dodge Cove is a historical community. Many hundreds of wooden fishing vessels were built there over the years. More important than that though, at this point is the dangers such a close LNG plant would have on the residents of Dodge Cove. i.e. risk of explosion or fire, compromised air quality, increased dangers from vessel congestion on the water approach to Prince Rupert harbour.</p> <p>I understand that the residents of Dodge Cove have many, many times approached the British Columbia Provincial government with their concerns. They have not received any replies from the sitting government. This proposed project affects them in so many ways besides safety, i.e. reduced land values, extreme stress, and they are taxpayers that deserve consideration.</p> <p>Personally I own a vessel and frequently transit the Prince Rupert Harbour. The congestion at the mouth of the harbour has already increased substantially. This project, basically at the mouth of the harbour, would make it much worse.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.</p>
27	2017-01-21	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace	<p>Build it Digby is perfect for an LNG no issues, no salmon streams no major wildlife except for wolves and deer can not find a better place</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>
28	2017-01-21	Betty Morton, Bowen Island	<p>I oppose all new components of LNG infrastructure because it creates a pathway to continued exponential increase in global warming at a time when climate change is at a tipping point.</p> <p>Canadians need to halt new fossil fuel development and redirect our economy towards non-carbon energy investment.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>

29	2017-01-21	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>I have concerns that the community of Dodge Cove has not been given any real data regarding what the effects of living 1/2 km to an LNG terminal would really be. There are a few other governments in the world that have also ignored SIGTTO international LNG standards and have built LNG terminals close to residences. I find it very surprising that there are no studies of baseline data and then after effects of the LNG terminals on the close by communities. How about a 5 year after study, a 10 year?</p> <p>When Russian scientists from Aniva Bay (Sakhalin LNG) travelled to Prince Rupert, we heard oral statements that communities close to Sakhalin have dealt with increased death, disease from new viruses that the doctors had no experience in and the people had no antibodies against, higher cancer rates, and other effects such as garden production rapidly dropping. There are online written statements from people living in Russia that support these and many other serious concerns.</p> <p>There is a community on Curtis Island, in Gladstone Australia, that must have had to deal with these effects as well. Gladstone certainly has, (as Prince Rupert will) and studies are available regarding the boomtown crisis there, the almost all male population, and why women do not wish to subject themselves to living there.</p> <p>There have also been many reports of the dredging problems close to Gladstone, the contamination in the water creating diseased fish and also some never seen before human infections that hospitalized several people. With all of these serious concerns - and the very real possibility of studying these before and after effects of LNG terminals close to communities, why is this data not compiled and supplied to communities to study whether or not they think having an LNG terminal so close to their homes is acceptable or not. NO PROOF has been supplied that this WILL NOT destroy our community/our health. Why are we having to prove that this WILL hurt us? The evidence is out there already. The real questions is whether or not the different government agencies are looking at it, including the BC Environmental Assessment Office, and whether or not that will matter to the BC Ministers who will be voting on the Aurora LNG project. Aurora LNG is too close to communities and should have been told NO right at the start, and definitely should be told NO RIGHT NOW!!</p> <p><a href="http://www.eca-watch.org/problems/eu_russ/russia/sakhalin/LazebnikKorsakovLNG_04dec04.htm">http://www.eca-watch.org/problems/eu_russ/russia/sakhalin/LazebnikKorsakovLNG_04dec04.htm</a>  <a href="https://sputniknews.com/russia/2006101654858938/">https://sputniknews.com/russia/2006101654858938/</a>  <a href="http://www.squamishchief.com/news/local-news/russians-tell-cautionary-Ing-tale-1.2183247">http://www.squamishchief.com/news/local-news/russians-tell-cautionary-Ing-tale-1.2183247</a>  <a href="http://theconversation.com/what-is-gladstones-Ing-development-really-doing-to-theenvironment-3885">http://theconversation.com/what-is-gladstones-Ing-development-really-doing-to-theenvironment-3885</a>  <a href="http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-11-09/gladstone-harbour-in-pictures-and-quotes/3650296">http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-11-09/gladstone-harbour-in-pictures-and-quotes/3650296</a>  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWkISQDRxdE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWkISQDRxdE</a>  <a href="https://www.sott.net/article/236021-Mystery-skin-disease-hits-Australian-fishermen">https://www.sott.net/article/236021-Mystery-skin-disease-hits-Australian-fishermen</a>  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-nGtbQmd-I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-nGtbQmd-I</a>  <a href="http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/fishermen-blame-water-for-breakout-of-boils-20111004-1179q.html">http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/fishermen-blame-water-for-breakout-of-boils-20111004-1179q.html</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
30	2017-01-21	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert	<p>I do not believe that Digby Island is a safe or reasonable place for an LNG facility. It is already and will continue to have negative impacts on the people that live on the island as well as the people across the harbour in Prince Rupert. LNG facilities should NEVER be situated close to human habitation - considering the noise, air quality, light pollution and potential for disaster to mention only a few issues. As well, the effects on marine traffic (we live and work on a boat) of an LNG facility right at the mouth of the Rupert Harbour is unimaginable. There is no reasonable reason to approve this facility and the government is negligent and I would say criminal to even consider it.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
31	2017-01-20	James Klassen - Fort Nelson	<p>To the BC environmental Assessment Office  Re: Aurora Digby Island Project  Please forgive my last submission - I didn't properly submit the town where I live.  My name is James Klassen and I am a resident of British Columbia.</p> <p>As a resident of British Columbia, I am a stake holder in all things for our province regarding our environment and our economy. I understand that Nexen is undertaking a great opportunity to build and do some significant investment regarding the LNG facility and terminal on Digby Island. As a resident of BC who is looking forward to the export of Natural Gas as a new industry, I recognize the significant impact our product will have in reducing emissions worldwide as it is used as a 'super fuel' in Asia. The reduction in GHG's and particulates in Asia will help us build a better world.</p> <p>I also want to emphasize the amount of jobs this will create in BC – not just in the construction phase, but also in maintenance and operation. The jobs won't just be in the Prince Rupert area but they will be assisting in creating vital infrastructure that connect NE BC and NW BC. Furthermore, upstream at the sources, Nexen has made significant investments and proven to be good corporate citizens. In BC we are striving for a world class delivery system that incorporates environmental stewardship and investments in technology - we are always looking for win-win solutions.</p> <p>I understand that Nexen chose Digby Island for their facility rather than the 'Grassy point' location because of structural engineering concerns based on soil conditions. This is a further proof that they aren't going to be haphazard in construction, but have done careful viability studies and surveys.</p> <p>I have reviewed some of the specific concerns regarding the immediate stakeholders in this project. I was very happy to see Nexen apply for this permit doing full consultation with the Gitxaala, Kitselas, Kitsumkalum, Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla First Nations. They forwarded sums to the key stake holders and other bands to do their own independent reviews. I believe that if Nexen addresses the majority of the concerns of these First Nations groups this will be a project that enhances their livelihood and gives them opportunities to grow in independence.</p> <p>I also understand that the 29 citizens of Dodge Cove on Digby Island have been consulted and I have read some of their tabled concerns under Nexen's submission. I believe that almost all of their concerns can be mitigated and am fairly convinced that Nexen is capable of reconciling their concerns, or will be able to make some restitution in cases where they need to.</p> <p>I was happy to see that Nexen will be fully complying with the BC requirements in their application and was thrilled to see that they have received a Canadian Federal permit for LNG export. I have full confidence in the work that they have done to date. Adherence to the Canadian Navigable Waters regulations will be taken seriously with the assistance of well-trained professional Canadian ships pilots. Canadian tugboats will meet and escort vessels – further demonstrations to the excellence of all things British Columbian.</p> <p>When I have seen Nexen at work in the construction of other projects in my own community, I have found them to be good community citizens. Not just in fair practices with local suppliers and businesses, but also in building important community connections for social health. Their environmental and safety compliance record in BC has been exemplary.</p> <p>One of the things that I am impressed with is Nexen's commitment to looking after this project from start to finish - and that they have plans in place for deactivating the facility when their license expires or the facility is no longer needed.</p> <p>In summary, I am excited for the opportunities that this project will create. I wish all the affected stake holders well. I look forward to hearing about Nexen's successes and valuable contributions to creating a successful and sustainable venture, because that's how we do business in BC.\</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>
32	2017-01-20	Personal Information Withheld - Nanaimo	<p>I am in complete favor of this project proceeding. Prince Rupert is a gateway to Asian markets for Canadian goods and resources. British Columbia (and Alberta) are blessed with rich natural resources like oil and gas that we can exploit to pay for all or social services and require access to coastal land and ports like Digby Island. It is time for the northwest to take advantage of projects like this. Thank you.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>

33	2017-01-19	G. Barry Stewart - Chilliwack	<p>I wish to go on record as being totally opposed to LNG projects in BC — at least those which intend to export the product, rather than use it for road or local water transportation fuel.</p> <p>My main concern is the hugely wasteful process which either uses dams-worth of our hydro power to pressurize and cool the gas — or burns off gas, to create electricity via steam turbines.</p> <p>In the first case, that lost hydro power would cause rates to go up for regular hydro users, as more-expensive IPP or Site C power would have to be bought to replace the power lost to the LNG plant. Ratepayers would get stuck with the higher rate, as BC Hydro cannot afford to eat the loss.</p> <p>If gas is used to run the "train," that is gas that could be used in homes and businesses in its gas form, from a pipeline. Again, the dip in gas supply would cause prices to go up for domestic consumers.</p> <p>If BC were poised to earn billions of revenue dollars, well... money talks and naysayers would get pushed or shamed out of the way — but there is no money in LNG, so why would we want the citizens of BC to suffer?</p> <p>Here's a link to an article by respected political blogger Norman Farrell on the great decline in gas revenues under the current government. It makes it clear that if there is money to be made in natural gas, it's not going to make its way to provincial coffers: <a href="https://in-sights.ca/2017/01/17/public-wealth-private-benefit/">https://in-sights.ca/2017/01/17/public-wealth-private-benefit/</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
34	2017-01-19	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove	<p>Right now the oil and gas companies are choosing LNG terminal locations, without any site screening process that looks at public health and safety.</p> <p>In Prince Rupert Harbour, the Prince Rupert Port Authority's "jurisdictional footprint" has been the reason that all these LNG terminal locations have been suggested, right up against the existing communities that are here. The BC and Federal government have no process for choosing sites, and yet that is a major focus of international LNG standards - LNG terminal siting - an important part of SIGTTO.</p> <p>Not to be near existing Marine Traffic Zones.</p> <p>Not to be near existing communities.</p> <p>Not to be near airports.</p> <p>If this LNG terminal is allowed to go forward, what scary precedence will be set for all Canadians, that LNG terminals can decide that any community is open game - without adhering to any of the international siting standards?</p> <p>Aurora LNG representatives call this a "game-changer". It sure will be, Canada will be allowing LNG terminals to be put anywhere - swallowing up communities. But this isn't a "game" to Dodge Cove residents. This is our life. This is our home. This is generations of history and tradition, and should be generations more. This is our future. Since 2 years ago, when the residents of Dodge Cove were made aware that the Chinese National Offshore Oil Company was going to look at Digby Island for Aurora LNG, it was clearly stated by the community that this (1/2 km away) was too close in proximity to have an LNG terminal.</p> <p><b>THIS IS CLEARLY THE WRONG LOCATION.</b></p> <p>So Dodge Cove is in a position we never envisioned in our wildest dreams (nightmares). Governments that do not care enough about Canadian Citizens to look at proposed terminal locations BEFORE an environmental assessment. We are supposed to look at the EA to see what this LNG terminal will do to our community, our property, our watershed, our health, the environment on Digby Island, the environment of the Skeena River Estuary, the environment of Prince Rupert, the shipping and fishing traffic in and out of Prince Rupert.</p> <p>We didn't need an EA for us to know that this location is too close to Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert and will have extreme negative impacts.</p> <p>Alot of focus and fuss is made about all the permits and approvals that Aurora LNG will have to apply for to build this terminal, but none of these deal directly with issues of safety and security. Heck, half the processes are "VOLUNTARY" not mandatory, or SELF-REGULATED (do you trust a foreign national company to be upstanding, open, and honest when they break laws in Canada?)</p> <p>It's great that there are some laws to protect fish and birds, whales etc, but there seems to be a complete lack of laws regarding PROTECTING PEOPLE!</p> <p>Environmental Assessment is such a ridiculous process. The oil and gas companies weakly look at certain things, edit the information then present it to the BCEAO to look over. Environmental Assessment is such a ridiculous process. The oil and gas companies weakly look at certain things, edit the information then present it to the BCEAO to look over.</p> <p>The EA process does not look at WHETHER or NOT the proposed location should even be considered. It just looks as the minimal science presented by the CNOOC-Nexen. This process is so ridiculous that the Federal government admits it is flawed, and is reviewing it. Yet the existing EA system is still being used to push these projects through.</p> <p><b>IS THIS A SUITABLE LOCATION FOR AN LNG TERMINAL? NO, NO, NO it is not.</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.</p>
35	2017-01-19	Personal Information Withheld - Fort Nelson	<p>Need something to keep this town going.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>
36	2017-01-18	Douglas Laird - Victoria	<p>This project is lunacy. I lived in this area for 25 years. To put a tanker facility in the narrow confines of a working harbour limits activity to the one purpose when docking a highly volatile - 246 degree cargo that would turn the steel hull into glass if there was a hairline crack in an aging insulation. There have been instances of fishing vessels run over and sunk since this narrow passage limits maneuverability by such large vessels. My second objection to this project is the inadequacy of the on shore and on ship cooling capacity which would lead to thermal changes in the ocean water. This area has a profile of high biological productivity and any thermal change would be critical to a variety of species. Bioaccumulation of PAH's is evident in the baseline criteria of environmental assessments, and these persistent molecules affect human health in ways that are not properly assessed in petrochemical project's environmental reviews.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.</p>
37	2017-01-18	Sascha Gilbert - Dodge Cove	<p>I am a recent addition to the Dodge Cove community, but the effect the threat of the Aurora LNG project is having on the community is inescapable.</p> <p>It is the subject on everyone's mind and in many passing conversations, the stress and tension from it is palpable.</p> <p>There are some community members that are considering selling out and leaving before their properties become valueless.</p> <p>Dodge Cove is a unique place, and I chose it as a place I wanted to live long term, buy property, perhaps raise a family.</p> <p>There are many environmental concerns around this proposed project, but forefront in my mind are the safety concerns regarding the 3.5km hazard zone surrounding the site in case of a catastrophic explosion.</p> <p>The community of dodge cove sits well within that hazard zone (500 meters in some places) while the city of Prince Rupert and the Town of Port Edward are not far enough to escape unscathed should such an event occur.</p> <p>I consider it highly irresponsible to plan a project of this nature so close to communities as well as the other industrial assets of the the Port of Prince Rupert.</p> <p>In conclusion, if this project is allowed to go through it will be a death sentence for a community that has stood more than 100 years and the end of a way of life for the people who live there.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the global LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
38	2017-01-18	Chance Whidden-Fort Nelson	<p>I fully support this project as a Fort Nelson resident</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>

39	2017-01-18	Personal Information Withheld - Fort Nelson	As a long time resident of Fort Nelson, I would be happy to have an environmental study done on the proposed Aurora Project. I truly believe that the oil and gas community has the knowledge to go ahead with the Aurora project environmentally responsible. This would be an opportunity to save our small town and put many of our unemployed back to work and save families from losing all they have worked so hard for	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
40	2017-01-18	Sean Beeson - Fort Nelson	The only impact to our community is all the help and assistance they bring to organizations like the seniors society and hospice society. Environmental impact will be almost zero.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
41	2017-01-17	Sue Staehli - Oregon	Digby Island is my fall-back plan. Two of my children were born there and its community and accessibility for all ages remains as a beacon for uncomplicated living. The quiet and clean environment there is a refuge for all creatures, and an outpost for humanity. The very idea that it has been slated for the same kind of degraded environment that surrounds most human development makes me ill and pushes me to despair. Please do not sacrifice this island to the tail end of a dying industry.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
42	2017-01-17	Tanya Speirs nee Spiller	Dodge Cove is very special to me and my family. I grew up there as a child from year one until almost a teen when we moved for work to Vancouver Island. I still feel like I'm home every time I visit. My Uncle still lives there and we hope to bring our growing family(7kids and 2 grandkids so far) there for many years to come. I loved beachcombing, exploring the forests and taking a passenger ferry to school each day. My life was molded by my upbringing in this unique community and my husband and children adore it there as well.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
43	2017-01-17	Debbie Larsen - Prince Rupert	It was a place of a wild childhood. Running on the mudflats chasing seagulls and racing crabs Building forts amongst the berry bushes and mossy ferns. Gathering around the bonfire with neighbours listening to laughing and stories of celebrations long past. Children hunt frogs and bugs in the ditches and fill pockets and pails to the brims. Walking to the dam dad built into the creek that brought water to our house. A life long lost but wistfully remembered. The road isn't as long or the hills as impossibly high as I remembered but I can still see the faces of my friends and hear the voices of the adults. I only wish my son knew the freedom I felt running wild through the berry patch and jumping lazy creeks	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
44	2017-01-17	Dorothy Spencer - Masset	I want to know what this LNG is doing on the only major shipping lane into Prince Rupert harbour. I want to know what they are doing to protect the people who have been living in Dodge Cove for so many generations. This Cove has huge historical significance for Prince Rupert, with the fishing disappearing, the canneries gone, and the boatbuilding backbone of how Prince Rupert grew. This is a "live" community with existing boat sheds, old school, and arts community that contributes to Prince Rupert culture. Everything the Port is doing to expedite the destruction of this community is deplorable and a blight on what Prince Rupert used to stand for. All for greed, not for community. Insensitive and dangerous for the perimeter of this LNG plant is a potential bomb with lip service to safety.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
45	2017-01-17	Judy Whaley - Prince Rupert	Digby Island has long been an oasis of quiet and peace for many of us who live in Prince Rupert. Our families have enjoyed many hours of fun exploring the beaches and trails there. The community holds craft fairs that are widely attended by people in both communities. These outings provide an opportunity to get away for many to spend time in a place of natural beauty. Any LNG development would hugely impact both communities. With limiting beach access as "progress" happens in our area, destroying this one last place of natural beauty, peace and calm for all of us, in the name of progress, would be a travesty. I would encourage Aurora LNG to pursue a different location for their development and leave Digby Island for the relaxation and enjoyment of all in our area.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
46	2017-01-17	Personal Information Withheld - Ireland	I worked hard so I could enjoy my retirement in Dodge Cove Digby Island. Now the beauty of the place will be destroyed with chemical pollution, noise pollution, light pollution and visual pollution. We will lose the wilderness and beauty of the West Coast.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
47	2017-01-17	Personal Information Withheld - Powell River	This LNG project would ruin a way of life for the communities on Digby Island and eventually devastate the salmon runs and other sea life dependent on clean water. I own a small home on Digby Island and I suggest you work on renewable energy projects! Prince Rupert area is perfect for both wind and tidal. Clean air and water is way more important to me than a few jobs. How can you sell your mother? Thank you	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
48	2017-02-08	Penelope Denton - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Welcome to Prince Rupert please come and save our city, community area and surrounding unique environment!! we trust you will follow the rules, and know you will be an asset for all of us !! this open house is an example of your commitment -- if you continue with this amazing public service, all of us will be on side --- thank you	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
49	2017-02-08	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I am impressed with the amount of research and studies that have been done so far. I believe that an LNG terminal on the coast will be beneficial, locally and provincially. I would like to add that I am supportive of this endeavor and hope it goes ahead.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
50	2017-02-08		Very informative. Pleasure to see Aurora making an effort to educate the public	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
51	2017-02-08	Bill Proteau - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	After listening to both sides, pro and nay, about this project, it is my opinion that this is acceptable industry for this area and of all the sites proposed for LNG this appears to be the right location for such a facility.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
52	2017-02-08	Brian Denton - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	"Hi Brian Denton here from Prince Rupert I have come tonight to give my full support of your project, on behalf of my wife and family. We welcome LNG to this area and welcome the positive attitude LNG have shown towards the importance of quality of life. So good luck and hurry up with this project for the benefit of all involved. "	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
53	2017-02-08	Sheila Pratt - Maple Ridge, British Columbia	I am not an expert. I do not intend to present information that I've read countless times before in countless places by people who stand to gain nothing financially but who are interested in protecting our environment and salmon who live in it. Delusion Bay should be protected just as Flora Bank should be protected from foreign corporations (or domestic corporations) only interested in their bottom lines and shareholder well-being. When will this government realize that you can't eat money? Protect Delusion Bay and the people who depend on a healthy Delusion Bay; British Columbia should owe nothing to Nexen.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.



54	2017-02-08	Personal Information Withheld - Prince George, British Columbia	"Before projects like this are considered, we (as individuals and as a country) need to think about whether or not we want another foreign-owned company imposing their interests for profit on the local people and environment. We also need to consider the cumulative impacts of various industrial developments in BC (especially in critical habitats that link the land and sea), something which has had far too little study and regulation to date. LNG is billed as a clean ""transition fuel"" yet the methods used to extract, process and transport it are not considered. It is those factors that really results in LNG doing more harm than good. One final thought, we need to be cognizant of the fact that the recent huge push to develop natural gas reserves (in the name of cutting down on oil consumption) could only lead to our society still being reliant on fossil fuels for another 50-100 years, only with natural gas not oil. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
55	2017-02-08	Des Belton -	Neither my wife nor I like what you have done already on Digby Island. You have already forced the abandonment of a heron rookery / nest site through your constant helicopter activity, and damaged bog areas which are amphibian habitat during your site exploration and planning. The site construction and final plant will irreparably destroy a huge area of bog which is currently habitat for blue listed western toads. Dredging for your loading dock will destroy prime salmon nursery habitat. I don't think the plant should be built at all, but if it is, why not locate it on some rocky island with deep water access?	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
56	2017-02-08	Onni Milne - Vancouver, British Columbia	I understand that Nexen plan to dredge and alter a large portion of the Delusion Bay habitat for a loading trestle. Why is this being considered when project impacts for Skeena Salmon are similar to those posed by Pacific North West LNG at Flora Bank. Dr. Barb Faggetter assigned a habitat value to the Delusion Bay area equal to that of Flora Bank. Studies carried out in the area show significant numbers of juvenile salmon. The project is very close to the community of Digby Island. Environmental and human health risks do NOT warrant approval for the project when wild salmon are the life blood of First Nations and fishery/tourist communities of the area.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the environmental assessment application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss.
57	2017-02-09	Sarah Ridgway - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	"The location is too close to the community of Dodge Cove, and the Prince Rupert Airport. The location is right in line with the storms we get and I can see that being a safety problem. The location is still the mouth of Prince rupert's shipping entrance. Hazard to navigation. And in amongst rocks and reefs. How are these issues being delt with? Is the community of Dodge Cove being consulted with and what about their ground surface collection of water? How would a road disrupt that or is lng willing to provide potable water to the community? "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing and take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation. To determine what should be included in the application, we engaged with members of our provincially appointed Working Group (Dodge Cove is a member of this Working Group) and the general public who provided input on the potential projects effects to be studied.
58	2017-02-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I'm very pleased that the Prince Rupert area is finally being recognized for its strategic location to foreign markets, and our country's interior. Projects such as Aurora are much needed in this community and Province. There will always be "nay-sayers", but progress must be made, and time waits for no one! i support all LNG projects, as long as they are done in an environmentally sensitive fashion, and focus primarily on employing as many locals as possible. Thank you	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
59	2017-02-09	James Hope - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	The Prince Rupert public information session answered many of my questions. I would like to hear more information on the overburden scrape away and storage before being used to landscape the area after construction. I would like a true scientific discussion of this. In all, I support the project.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
60	2017-02-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	"There is nothing about this project that I can agree with. I attended the open house in Prince Rupert on February 8, and left feeling sad and unsettled. Prince Rupert is a small town in a stunningly beautiful setting, and this LNG project would be a carbuncle on our lovely landscape. I have enormous concerns about the effect on the environment, despite the energetic arguments about mitigations provided at your open house. I asked one of the proponent's representatives about protection for birds, citing an incident in New Brunswick where 7,500 birds were killed by the gas glare at an LNG plant. <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-in-saint-john-1.1857615">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-in-saint-john-1.1857615</a> I was told that the flare would be shut down when migratory birds were in the area. Really?? This is hardly believable. I am concerned about what, if any, benefits will come to our city. When I asked your staff how they would transport their workers to the site, I was informed that they would be flown in, then transported by bus to the camp on site. Given the difficulty of getting from Digby Island to Prince Rupert it can be assumed that these workers would not be coming into town to patronize our restaurants and shops. When I asked how the operation crews would be transported from the city to the plant when it's up and running, the man I spoke with was not able to provide an answer. Does this mean that the people who will be running the plant will be flown in and out, and not be resident in Prince Rupert? Each member of the proponent's crew should ask themselves how they would feel if this project was built within sight of their own home. It's easy to promote something if it's not in your back yard. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
61	2017-02-09	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace, British Columbia	How has our government determined that this is in the best interests of the people of British Columbia and specifically the people who live near this proposed project? Has the government taken into account the negative effects of this project in comparison to any perceived financial gains. How does this project accommodate the federal government's stand on global warming? I think that short term fabricated financial gain has informed this decision and that the people of Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert will pay a very heavy price.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
62	2017-02-10	James Ridgway - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Hello I'm a dodge property owner and I am not against lng development although certain individuals there are leading the impression that dodge is unanimously opposed it is not the case any way what I would like to know is if there will be any benefits available to us if development went through one that comes to mind is the quality of community water which is not potable now the other is maybe some road access I have seen a map of yours showing a service road quite close by thank u for your time	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project. Aurora LNG looks forward to continued engagement with the community of Dodge Cove.

63	2017-02-13	Janice Melin - Canoe, British Columbia	"I love Digby Island. I lived there as a child off and on with my mother and father. My greatgrandfather Julius Hadland had a mill there for awhile as well. Lots of relatives lived on that island. It is a beautiful paradise away from the city. Indian rice by Donnie Larsons old place. Toads ahopping. Paradise for children to play as well. In the summer it is very special as it is warmer than Prince Rupert where I lived 42 years. Loved hiking out to the old army area as well. The soldiers were good to my dads family during WW2 as well. It is a historical area for me."	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
64	2017-02-13	Nancy Garland, Campbell River, British Columbia	This is a money grab for Christy Clark and the Lieberals. They have sold this province twice over to anyone with enough money. LNG is more expensive to get out of the ground than it is worth. B.C. should be looking at wind, solar and geothermal energy. No to LNG, SITE C, pipelines and fossil minded fossil fuels, we demand the B.C. government start working for B.C. not their party \$upporters.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
65	2017-02-12	Personal Information Withheld, Dodge Cove, British Columbia	"I am greatly concerned by the new changes to the BCEAO website which does NOT seem to allow the saving of public documents, the copying of public documents, or printing of public documents. Since I have been using the previous BCEAO website for two years without any issues in these areas, it seems very strange that it is harder to access, read, comment on, and use what is supposed to be publicly available information. It especially seems to go against encouraging trust in the process, and transparency, as well as seems to DISCOURAGE computer users and the public from easily being part of the process and sharing information with those concerned. Many people have been having difficulty in accessing certain links and finding information. It seems to me many improvements need to be made regarding the BCEAO website. As a public forum, why can I no longer share the information easily? How discouraging for people who are have concerns and are trying to learn more about the Aurora LNG project, making it harder for people to be part of the FINAL public comment period for Aurora LNG, making it harder for people to part of the process"	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.
66	2017-02-15	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	"I have concerns that the effects to the entire Skeena River are not being looked at, and the effects up and down the coast that will result in the proposed major disturbance of situating the CNOOCNexen Aurora LNG terminal right in critical marine habitat. Delusion Bay on Digby Island is a highly valuable habitat for many fish species, which in turn support the marine mammals, birds and other species of which the marine life is a critical part of the food web. Study of Skeena River Estuary Juvenile Salmon Habitat ""The southwest shore of Lelu Island and Delusion Bay (south end of Digby Island)are highly valuable habitats for neritic feeding species (e.g., Coho, sockeye, and steelhead)."" Page vi <a href="http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf">http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf</a> ""...estuaries provide essential nursery and juvenile rearing habitats, with up to 80% of coastal wildlife species relying on estuaries during at least one stage of their life history (BCMOE 2006)"" As this report goes into great detail of habitat suitability - why the Skeena River Estuary is important for fish habitat, and the role that Delusion Bay and the south end of Digby Island plays in habitat for fish, I would hope that all the maps, information, and studies will be looked at. It seems to be contradictory to many of the findings of CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG in their Final Application. ""High levels of sediment and turbidity can reduce water quality in the estuary. Both of these conditions may affect the growth of eelgrass beds, the availability of food, and the survival of Page 10 of 32 <a href="http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/comments/aurora_digby_comments.html">http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/comments/aurora_digby_comments.html</a> 2017-02-24 juvenile salmon."" ""Filling, diking, dredging, and infrastructure development can damage or alter important nearshore or estuarine habitat, including riparian vegetation and eelgrass beds. Early marine survival of wild salmon depends on sheltered, intact coastal habitats as well as abundant food resources found in these habitats."" ""Local shoreline development can lead to temporary or permanent loss of estuarine intertidal wetlands, which are an important nearshore habitat for juvenile salmon."" <a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/libraryfiles/lib_432.pdf">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/libraryfiles/lib_432.pdf</a> <a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_433/">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_433/</a> <a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_434/">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_434/</a> All the maps, information, and extended data related to this report highlights the importance of the south end of Digby Island and the Skeena Estuary. It highlights the importance of chlorophyll, activity. These need to be studied, as they seem to contradict many of the assumptions that Aurora LNG has made about the south end of Digby Island. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.
67	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace, British Columbia	I am 100% AGAINST LNG development. British Columbia's nascent LNG industry requires massive amounts of new fracking wells drilled in Northeast BC. This area is currently undergoing rampant development, with little regulation and even less public consultation. Vast amounts of freshwater are siphoned out of the Williston Reservoir, as well as rivers and lakes across the region. Thousands of gallons of toxic waste water will be dumped into underground aquifers, posing a serious threat to freshwater. The area's remaining wilderness areas will be eaten away by clear cuts, road access, pipelines and transmission lines: impacting wildlife corridors, critical habitat and degrading ecosystem integrity. ANYONE WHO UNDERSTANDS FRACKING IS OPPOSED TO IT. If they understand it but still support it, then they must be gaining profit from it. There is no "Grey Area" with fracking. There is nothing good about it. There is no such thing as safe fracking.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
68	2017-02-18	Neil Frazer - Powell River, British Columbia	"Dear Director, BC EAO, I am opposed to the proposed Aurora LNG Digby Island project because of the threat it poses to migratory birds and nearby salmon habitat. Skeena salmon are essential to BC's coastal and interior ecosystems because of the way they transport marine protein from the high seas to our forests. They therefore deserve our concern and protection. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
69	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	"A few years ago, Canaport LNG (import terminal on East Coast Canada) killed 7500 migrating birds - some endangered species - through flaring. THE BIRDS WERE ATTRACTED TO THE LIGHT and flew right into it. Digby Island and the Delusion Bay area (south end of Digby Island) is considered a NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANT BIRD AREA. There is another GLOBALLY AND NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANT BIRD AREA to the southwest of Digby Island as well. This is part of the Pacific Flyway for migrating birds. We have large amounts of migratory birds using this island in their routes, including endangered species. We have Species of Special Concern such as Great Blue Herons that have nesting rookeries here on the island, and live here year round. Many water birds are also recognized as Species of Special Concern. Many birds have not even been included in the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG study. Effects of Gas Flaring on the Behavior of Night-Migrating Birds ""The general flight behavior of birds also differed significantly, with higher percentages of both radar targets and bird flocks exhibiting straight-line (directional) flight behaviors during the non-flaring periods and higher percentages of radar targets and bird flocks exhibiting non-straight-line (erratic and circling) flight behaviors during the gas-flaring period. During the night of gas flaring, the bright illumination appeared to have an effect after sunset, when flocks of birds circled the island after being drawn in from what appeared to be a substantial distance from the island...illumination from extensive gas-flaring is such a strong attractant to migrating birds"". Perhaps the most dangerous conditions for birds occur when they encounter bright lights in conjunction with large structures, especially during stormy or foggy conditions (e.g., Howell et al., 1954; Dick and Donaldson, 1978; Hope-Jones, 1980; Jones and Francis, 2003; Montevecchi, 2006; Gauthreaux and Belsler, 2006) <a href="http://arctic.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/arctic/index.php/arctic/article/view/4507/4634">http://arctic.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/arctic/index.php/arctic/article/view/4507/4634</a> <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-insaint-john-1.1857615">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-insaint-john-1.1857615</a> ""The estuary mudflats and other intertidal areas have also been identified by the North Coast Wetlands Program as important migratory/wintering waterfowl habitat. Several rare species, including the yellow-listed trumpeter swan, which has suffered a significant reduction in range, the blue-listed brant, old squaw and great blue heron, and the red-listed western grebe, have all been recorded in the wetlands. (around the Skeena Estuary)."" <a href="http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf">http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf</a> I am concerned on the impacts on the migratory, marine, and songbirds, that will be affected both by direct changes to Digby Island, and the wetlands on Digby Island that provide them with food and habitat.Also the changes to the food sources for birds in the surrounding area, such as changes to the marine life that will affect the birds diet. I don't believe the wide-ranging impacts to the rich Skeena River Estuary have been properly assessed, or how those changes will impact the wider coast and changes to the food supply for other species? What National and Global changes would take place with this severe impact to the Skeena Estuary? "	Given the large bird mortality event recorded at the Canaport facility in New Brunswick in 2013, Aurora LNG recognizes the potential for Project flaring to result in changes in bird movement, which can contribute to increased potential for injury or mortality. Potential residual Project effects related to flaring are described in Sections 4.7.5.3 and 4.11.5.3 of the Application. Aurora LNG considered placement options of the flare system within the PDA to reduce potential interaction with migratory birds and to limit the amount of light dispersal that could influence bird movement (Table 1-26). Aurora LNG has committed to several measures to reduce the potential for flaring effects to birds, and to monitor for those effects. As per mitigation 4.5.1, a 30 m riparian buffer will be applied during all Project phases to retain shoreline habitats and limit noise and light dispersal. The buffer is expected to further reduce potential for disturbance to marine species using shoreline and nearshore habitats in Delusion Bay. As part of Mitigation 4.7.13 and 4.7.14, Aurora LNG will provide educational materials to increase awareness of lighting effects of bird and opportunities for reducing light dispersal during sensitive timing periods (e.g., migration, inclement weather); facility staff will document and report bird injury or mortality associated with flaring to provide ongoing monitoring throughout Project operations. Mitigation 4.7.20 outlines that maintenance flaring events will be scheduled during daylight hours to the extent practicable to reduce potential attraction by birds and bats to flare system infrastructure during nocturnal migration or foraging. Sections 4.7.5.2 and 4.11.5.2 of the Application provides a discussion of change in breeding, foraging, staging, and overwintering habitat for terrestrial and marine birds, including species of conservation concern. These sections describe changes in different habitat communities on and adjacent to Digby Island, including change in wetland and estuarine habitat, and the associated residual effects to species from those changes. Table 4.7-10 and 4.11-9 outline the mitigation measures that Aurora LNG has committed to as a means to reduce potential residual effects from change in habitat to terrestrial wildlife and marine birds. Section 4.11.5.2 describes changes in habitat for marine birds and considers changes in marine prey availability, distribution, and health as outlined in Section 4.9 of the Application. For both terrestrial and marine bird species, the characterization of residual effects considers the spatial and temporal extent of Project effects and how they are expected to interact with terrestrial wildlife and marine birds. A residual effect was considered significant if it affects the viability of local or regional terrestrial wildlife or marine bird populations.

70	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Powell River, British Columbia	"Alternative energy! Now! Not when all our resources are gone. People's lives matter more than money. STOP "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
71	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	"This entire article needs to be looked at closely. There seems to be a large difference between the statements made about LNG tankers and terminals along the East Coast of Canada, and here in British Columbia. The Transport Canada Marine Safety in the the Atlantic Region are clear in using examples of safety and security zones in US ports include: Cook Inlet - Alaska - export terminal maintains a 3000 feet radius zone around the terminal and the berthed ships, and ships transiting to and from the terminal. They are also clear on why safety and security zones are needed - for the safety of existing marine traffic and populations. Many examples are included, of which CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG will NOT be meeting standards of, according to their application. Aurora LNG would only have a MAXIMUM of 1/2 that distance since it is only approx. 1500 feet from the LNG tanker berthing to the CENTRE of the mouth of Prince Rupert Harbour (a very narrow entrance, of which some is completely unusable due to shallow waters or unsafe rocks/proximity to beach). Transport Canada says that the release of LNG overboard would be detrimental to the safety of passing craft. <a href="https://www.scribd.com/doc/23180768/LNG-Vessel-Safety-Zones">https://www.scribd.com/doc/23180768/LNG-Vessel-Safety-Zones</a> ""the federal government's double standards regarding the safety of LNG shipments along Canada's coastline. The federal government has actively fought against the construction of an American LNG terminal known as the ""Downeast LNG Project."" If constructed, this project would see LNG carrier ships pass through New Brunswick's Head Harbour Passage. Canadian Ambassador to the United States Gary Doer has outlined Canada's ""strong concerns"" around Downeast LNG in two letters to US regulators, pointing to the serious environmental, navigational and safety risks of the project."" <a href="http://rafeonline.com/2015/06/harper-says-lngtankers-too-dangerous-for-east-coast-but-ok-for-bc/">http://rafeonline.com/2015/06/harper-says-lngtankers-too-dangerous-for-east-coast-but-ok-for-bc/</a> ""The Government has concerns about the possible impacts on Canada from LNG tanker traffic through Head Harbour Passage,"" a foreign affairs spokesperson told The Tyee via e-mail. ""Specifically, Canada has concerns about the potential impact of LNG tanker traffic on marine safety in the narrow passage of Head Harbour as well as the local wildlife and the fishing industry."" And then there is the threat of terrorist attacks. A 2005 study led by Clinton-era counter-terrorist adviser Richard Clarke assessed the likelihood and possible consequences of an attack on an LNG facility or tanker in a densely populated area, in this case Rhode Island. The main conclusion? Keep those things away from people or you are asking for trouble."" <a href="https://thetyee.ca/News/2007/10/11/LiquifiedNatGas/">https://thetyee.ca/News/2007/10/11/LiquifiedNatGas/</a> Earlier this year, Canada's Ambassador in Washington, Michael Wilson, wrote to U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice that the projects ""present risks to the region of southwest New Brunswick and its inhabitants that the government of Canada cannot accept."" ""This particular location is not a smart location, it's not a safe location,"" Mr. Thompson said. ""And we consider those internal Canadian waters so we have a responsibility to protect our citizens, protect the environment and protect the economy."" <a href="http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/ottawa-unmoved-by-positive-lingstudy/article18146775/">http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/ottawa-unmoved-by-positive-lingstudy/article18146775/</a> All of this information seems to support the fact that LNG was considered too dangerous for Canadian citizens on the East Coast - and Transport Canada in the Atlantic Region produced public reports on the safety and security of LNG terminals and tankers. The same cannot be said for B.C., or for the proximity of the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project to the existing marine traffic zones and communities of Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpdipBRJ3V0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpdipBRJ3V0</a> Large explosion rocks Washington LNG plant; 5 workers hurt, 400 residents evacuated - news story "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.
72	2017-02-20	Robert Brent Patriquin - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Aurora LNG is proposing to build their facility on Digby Island at the mouth of the harbour to Prince Rupert. Some of the information I have read mandates exclusion zones around such facilities and these are clearly being neglected. With industrialization and the global security threat Prince Rupert Harbour is becoming more difficult to access recreationally, be it on shore or water. Our life style is being severely impacted and will be much more so if this plan goes through. As one last reflection, Digby Island is the site of Prince Rupert's only airport. The runway runs approximately north- south, putting the proposed LNG site, on the south end of the island, just east of the flight path for aircraft.....I wonder? in the planning stages of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant were there any voices questioning the wisdom of this site, at sea level, in an active earthquake zone. Let's learn from the past, not repeat it	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.
73	2017-02-20	Personal Information Withheld - New Hazelton, British Columbia	"I am opposed to the the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project. The project will bring temporary jobs to the area but will not provide long-term job security. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
74	2017-02-20	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	"I have several concerns with the proposed project. The proponent has taken a very low profile approach with the project and there has been little to no discussion or education in the local media at a level the general public can understand. While they have a long list of supposed consultation, the general public is generally unaware of the project. This has come about from environmental assessment fatigue as Prince Rupert has been the epicenter of assessments. There have been more projects with endless binders of incomprehensible information than a person can manage. Secondly, I was told at the open house that apart from one tiny little spot at fairview on occasion, air emission issues will not be a problem. It doesn't matter that you produced a 300 page document that only an air quality technician can read, but it stands to reason that burning 25 million tonnes of LNG downwind of our community cannot occur without a major impact to human health. Third, while we are being asked to live with the impacts and risks, there has been nothing provided about how the project will be benefit the community directly. A few indirect jobs etc, but you are not going to pay municipal taxes and rebuild this town. It is also a joke how you engage with the Dodge Cove residents and pretend you can mitigate the problems. You should just be upfront and admit you will destroy the place so why don't you just offer them a big fat buyout? I have little confidence that this project will benefit the community."	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work. Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.

75 (1 of 2)	2017-02-21	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>"The broader contexts of which Digby Island residents use, manage, and occupy the surrounding land needs to be considered. We have interests in the proposed area of development. The government wants information relating to the specific nature of those interests. This process of soliciting information puts the onus on Dodge Cove and other Digby Island residents to review its interests in the area affected by the decision and then to formulate a written response to the proposed development. ""Discussions"" and ""mitigation"" fail to reflect the true relationship we have with the place we live. Many communities, especially small ones such as Dodge Cove, struggle to participate fully in the consultation process. Responses require the compilation and presentation of information. With very little help or experience in doing so, how are we, the residents of Digby Island, supposed to compile generations of information and local knowledge into a presentable case that reflect s accurately how integrated our entire lives are with the natural function of Digby Island? This is an almost impossible task especially with a very tight time frame, and most of our information is maintained not in recorded writings but in the knowledge of past and present residents. An entire history of a community should not be dismissed so easily as CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG Final Application has done. The broader ethnographic contexts of our history and our culture are rarely considered. Our perspectives which unite our understanding of the land with our social and community activities are greatly different from a compartmentalized planning process. We are expected to separate information about our local biology from information about our cultural practices. The fact that our communities will be devastatingly impacted and changed beyond any measure of our present knowledge is not accurately captured in the Auora LNG final application. With little bits of information stuck in throughout the application, instead of a solid highly detailed description of our community, it's longevity, and any history that could accurately reflect a portion of what needs to be acknowledged. As well, any traditional use studies identify location of activities and minimize the importance of our places, our activities on the land, and the complexities of our family-based connections to these places. Our interests are being limited mostly to the area of the proposal, even though that same proposal will change the entire ecosystem of Digby Island, and so our interests on our use extend to the entire island which will be dramatically negatively impacted. Any traditional use studies do not take into account holistic or spiritual importance of these land uses for our community. Biodiversity, sustainability, and ecosystem functions will be compromised for the entire Digby Island. This has to be acknowledged and our land use and affect to our community has to reflect this. For our community, practices such as hunting and fishing, food gathering and simply being part of the natural life in this area are broadly integrated into our land use and movement of people, and family relationships. The studies by CNOOC-Nexen for Aurora LNG try to state where activities have occurred but there fails to be a comprehensive and holistic understanding, and recognition, of our cultural practices and ideological connections to the land and the surrounding living things. Site-specific land use maps also draw attention only to particular locations on a map while minimizing the cultural value of the space in between those locations. So much attention is given to to the places in which people say they conduct activities that a wider area, an important of place in and of itself, is forgotten. Traditional land use studies focus on a restricted number of activities and interests, and do not pay attention to spirituality and culture. They do not accurately reflect how communities such as Dodge Cove use the land in part to poor understanding of the culture that we have here. We must assert the importance of place to communities such as ours, to the people that live here, and to the personal and social identities of both. Existence requires emplacement. A focused awareness founded on the experiences of the individual at a particular location. There is a complete non-awareness from CNOOC-Nexen employees of the culture in this area, and a disconnect in understanding the motivations and roots that communities like ours instill in individuals.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. To determine what should be included in the application, we engaged with members of our provincially appointed Working Group and the general public who provided input on the potential projects effects to be studied.</p>
75 (2 of 2)	2017-02-21	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>There has never been a fixed boundary map around the area of use for us - there has never been a fixed boundary of only using the land and waters inside Dodge Cove Official Community Plan. This process is making us define our usage overtop of lands when in effect we have all been sharing the use of these lands and waters. How do you define boundaries on land and water like that? Even the smallest of our use footprints is connected to the larger area of Digby Island and the surrounding waters, to the historical and present movement of our community, and the connection to our homes. The fluid and flexible nature of our way of thinking and our activities is not represented by a map of fixed boundaries. A cultural security and continuity approach regards a land base as necessary to cultural identity and survival. Our identity is linked to a long history of Digby Island. If we look only at the proposal site, that is a piecemeal small-spot approach to the proposal. We need to consider the impact to the entire area that we use, as the proposal is a vast majority of that area and impact will extend to our entire land and water use area. We have been the habitual land/water users of Digby Island for over 100 years - the entire area surrounding our community, although actual resources were freely shared and exchanged. Consideration has to be given to the impact on the surrounding vegetation and streams and any other area even if not in the project footprint. The land has defined and sustained us as a people. The spaces between maps have to be viewed as part of larger, culturally meaningful area. That area is NOT freely available/awaiting development. We have emotional and spiritual connections to places even if we do not have location specific markers. All sites are connected to the wider area and cultural identity and continuity. A lack of demonstrable use of the land does not mean a lack of knowledge, connection, or claim to that land. We are careful about our impact on the island and always have been. The Aurora LNG Final Application mentions that they have observed certain areas to be high-use by our community (such as Casey Cove/Marine Bay) but have not seen significant use of the rest of Digby Island. This is pimarilly due to the fact that the CNOOC-Nexen employees have been on the island, inhibiting hunting and other activity - the helicopter traffic in the last year has been significantly disturbing both to Dodge Cove residents and to the wildlife on the island, the community was specifically told by Nexen to not go anywhere near where they were working, and at times when people did try to continue their usual activities there were told to leave by CNOOC-Nexen employees. Therefore the use of the island and waters while CNOOC-Nexen has invaded the island have not been the norm, also factor into that residents have been overwhelmed by stress, meetings, and paperwork trying to study and be informed regarding the negative impacts that the Aurora LNG export terminal would have on our community, on top of their daily work and regular chores to the point that it has been impossible to live in the same manner that we have been accustomed to for decades. There is a lack of nuanced, qualitative research by CNOOC-NEXEN on the impacts of the Aurora LNG terminal. The final application for Aurora LNG fails to acknowledge the devastating impact that the Aurora LNG export terminal would have on the culture and identity of the residents on Digby island, fails to acknowledge the traditional knowledge and use of the land and surrounding areas in any meaningful way, fails to acknowledge the impact that this project will have on the surrounding area as if the impact will mostly be constrained within the boundaries of the Project area. The Aurora LNG project Final Application uses very old and inaccurate methods of trying to measure land use, and fails to acknowledge that never before have we used this area within boundaries on a map, and ecological and cultural impacts cannot be defined by those boundaries. Referenced from article: Making Place for Space: Land Use and Occupancy Studies, Counter-Mapping, and the Supreme Court of Canada's Tsilhqot'in Decision By Thomas McIlwraith and Raymond Cormier - printed in BC Studies Number 188 Winter 2015 /16 "</p>	

76	2017-02-21	Personal Information Withheld - Kispiox Valley, British Columbia	"There is sufficient evidence to show that LNG produced by burning natural gas along with the fracking and compressor stations will produce more greenhouse gases than burning coal for the same amount of electricity. The electricity to power LNG conversion would be created by burning fracked gas on site. Acid rain and degraded air quality would be introduced to northern B.C. How will Canada and B.C. make it's commitment to reducing greenhouse gases- it won't if this project goes through. This is not the direction that Canada should go. We should be pursuing renewable energy projects. The dredging of delusion bay will be another blow to the health of Juvenile salmon habitat. The disruption of the community of Dodge cove will be devastating. The ""nox"" gasses produced by burning the fracked = gasses for lng production will cause problems throughout the Prince Rupert area in poor weather conditions. The increased tanker traffic in an already crowded corridor will be a cause for concern. There are many reasons for not pursuing an LNG terminal on Digby Island or anywhere else in northern B.C. , so why take chances on the health and sustainability of our northern communities. Please do not go forward with this project!"	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act. As outlined in the environmental assessment application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss.
77	2017-02-21	Jan Yeb's Ypma - Dodge Cove, Digby Island, British Columbia	"A government can be called noble-minded if it shows respect and honours quality of life for its citizenry. > Isn't it wonderful to know that British Columbia is such a place?"	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
78	2017-02-21	Jan Yeb's Ypma - Dodge Cove, Digby Island, British Columbia	"Not going ahead with this project..... protecting the quality of life of all Digby Island inhabitants, including the areas' abundant but fragile wealth of marine and terrestrial flora and fauna, now that would be something to be proud of, eh what? Can we expect such a richness of vision and wisdom from Canada and BC? Yes, we can, for this is the new, post-industrial Canada. "	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
79	2017-02-21	Jan Yeb's Ypma - Dodge Cove, Digby Island, British Columbia	What a rare little gem of a place this Digby Island is! So close to Prince Rupert and yet so rich with native and later settler's history. So accessible to other Canadians who wish to enjoy the natural wealth of the area's flora and fauna. Why jeopardize it in this day and age, when these qualities are disappearing before our eyes?	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
80	2017-02-21	Jan Yeb's Ypma - Dodge Cove, Digby Island, British Columbia	That this project, so close to the village of Dodge Cove and its citizens in terms of threats to the quality of life, the safety of our water supply, the negative effects of noise, air pollution, and marine traffic safety should NOT be approved as presently planned, is a foregone conclusion.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
81	2017-02-14	Sheila Hall	Why are you continuing to add megatons of carbon pollution to an already overloaded planet instead of promoting alternative energy production? Do you have no consideration for our grandchildren? Have you no consideration for marine and bird life? Have you no consideration for the community affected by this project? It seems to me that you are completely out of touch with Canadians and our life-giving Earth. Please, please, please - this project must NOT Be allowed. Sheila Hall Vancouver, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
82	2017-02-15	Bridget Meagher	Please do not allow the Aurora LNG project to proceed. No amount of corporate profit is worth damaging the coastal ecosystem and community at Dodge Cove and Digby Island. Our priorities must be on protecting our coasts and reducing our impact on climate change. Please show leadership and respect for our future generations by stopping the project. Thank you, Bridget Meagher Vancouver, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
83	2017-02-15	Bernadette Keenan	Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents. Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic. Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island. This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions. Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk! Bernadette Keenan Surrey, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing and take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.

84	2017-02-15	Deena Guffei	<p>Hi there, Please strongly consider the following points regarding the Aurora LNG project. Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents. Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centers and other marine traffic. Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbor porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island. This facility and upstream development would produce 15 mega tonnes of carbon pollution, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions. Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk! Strongly consider these points and reject this project for the sake of our community and future generations. Deena Guffei Vancouver, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
85	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>This entire article needs to be looked at closely. There seems to be a large difference between the statements made about LNG tankers and terminals along the East Coast of Canada, and here in British Columbia. The Transport Canada Marine Safety in the the Atlantic Region are clear in using examples of safety and security zones in US ports include: Cook Inlet - Alaska - export terminal maintains a 3000 feet radius zone around the terminal and the berthed ships, and ships transiting to and from the terminal. They are also clear on why safety and security zones are needed - for the safety of existing marine traffic and populations. Many examples are included, of which CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG will NOT be meeting standards of, according to their application. Aurora LNG would only have a MAXIMUM of 1/2 that distance since it is only approx. 1500 feet from the LNG tanker berthing to the CENTRE of the mouth of Prince Rupert Harbour (a very narrow entrance, of which some is completely unusable due to shallow waters or unsafe rocks/proximity to beach). Transport Canada says that the release of LNG overboard would be detrimental to the safety of passing craft. <a href="https://www.scribd.com/doc/23180768/LNG-Vessel-Safety-Zones">https://www.scribd.com/doc/23180768/LNG-Vessel-Safety-Zones</a> "the federal government's double standards regarding the safety of LNG shipments along Canada's coastline. The federal government has actively fought against the construction of an American LNG terminal known as the "Downeast LNG Project." If constructed, this project would see LNG carrier ships pass through New Brunswick's Head Harbour Passage. Canadian Ambassador to the United States Gary Doer has outlined Canada's "strong concerns" around Downeast LNG in two letters to US regulators, pointing to the serious environmental, navigational and safety risks of the project."<a href="http://rafeonline.com/2015/06/harper-says-lng-tankers-too-dangerous-for-east-coast-but-ok-for-bc/">http://rafeonline.com/2015/06/harper-says-lng-tankers-too-dangerous-for-east-coast-but-ok-for-bc/</a> "The Government has concerns about the possible impacts on Canada from LNG tanker traffic through Head Harbour Passage," a foreign affairs spokesperson told The Tyee via e-mail. "Specifically, Canada has concerns about the potential impact of LNG tanker traffic on marine safety in the narrow passage of Head Harbour as well as the local wildlife and the fishing industry." And then there is the threat of terrorist attacks. A 2005 study led by Clinton-era counter-terrorism adviser Richard Clarke assessed the likelihood and possible consequences of an attack on an LNG facility or tanker in a densely populated area, in this case Rhode Island. The main conclusion? Keep those things away from people or you are asking for trouble." <a href="https://thetyee.ca/News/2007/10/11/LiquifiedNatGas/">https://thetyee.ca/News/2007/10/11/LiquifiedNatGas/</a> Earlier this year, Canada's Ambassador in Washington, Michael Wilson, wrote to U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice that the projects "present risks to the region of southwest New Brunswick and its inhabitants that the government of Canada cannot accept." "This particular location is not a smart location, it's not a safe location," Mr. Thompson said. "And we consider those internal Canadian waters so we have a responsibility to protect our citizens, protect the environment and protect the economy." <a href="http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/ottawa-unmoved-by-positive-Ing-study/article18146775/">http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/ottawa-unmoved-by-positive-Ing-study/article18146775/</a> All of this information seems to support the fact that LNG was considered too dangerous for Canadian citizens on the East Coast - and Transport Canada in the Atlantic Region produced public reports on the safety and security of LNG terminals and tankers. The same cannot be said for B.C., or for the proximity of the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project to the existing marine traffic zones and communities of Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpdipBRJ3V0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpdipBRJ3V0</a> Large explosion rocks Washington LNG plant; 5 workers hurt, 400 residents evacuated - news story</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. Canada's Navigation Protection Act must be complied with when building a marine terminal. Compliance with this Act and its supporting regulations ensures that other waterway users rights to water access and safety are safeguarded during construction of the terminal and when it is put into operation.</p>
86	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Powell River, British Columbia	<p>Alternative energy! Now! Not when all our resources are gone. People's lives matter more than money. STOP</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

87	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>A few years ago, Canaport LNG (import terminal on East Coast Canada) killed 7500 migrating birds - some endangered species - through flaring. THE BIRDS WERE ATTRACTED TO THE LIGHT and flew right into it.</p> <p>Digby Island and the Delusion Bay area (south end of Digby Island) is considered a NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANT BIRD AREA. There is another GLOBALLY AND NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANT BIRD AREA to the southwest of Digby Island as well. This is part of the Pacific Flyway for migrating birds.</p> <p>We have large amounts of migratory birds using this island in their routes, including endangered species. We have Species of Special Concern such as Great Blue Herons that have nesting rookeries here on the island, and live here year round. Many water birds are also recognized as Species of Special Concern. Many birds have not even been included in the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG study.</p> <p>Effects of Gas Flaring on the Behavior of Night-Migrating Birds "The general flight behavior of birds also differed significantly, with higher percentages of both radar targets and bird flocks exhibiting straight-line (directional) flight behaviors during the non-flaring periods and higher percentages of radar targets and bird flocks exhibiting non-straight-line (erratic and circling) flight behaviors during the gas-flaring period. During the night of gas flaring, the bright illumination appeared to have an effect after sunset, when flocks of birds circled the island after being drawn in from what appeared to be a substantial distance from the island...illumination from extensive gas-flaring is such a strong attractant to migrating birds"</p> <p>Perhaps the most dangerous conditions for birds occur when they encounter bright lights in conjunction with large structures, especially during stormy or foggy conditions (e.g., Howell et al., 1954; Dick and Donaldson, 1978; Hope-Jones, 1980; Jones and Francis, 2003; Montevocchi, 2006; Gauthreaux and Belsler, 2006)  <a href="http://arctic.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/arctic/index.php/arctic/article/view/4507/4634">http://arctic.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/arctic/index.php/arctic/article/view/4507/4634</a>  <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-in-saint-john-1.1857615">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/7-500-songbirds-killed-at-canaport-gas-plant-in-saint-john-1.1857615</a></p> <p>"The estuary mudflats and other intertidal areas have also been identified by the North Coast Wetlands Program as important migratory/wintering waterfowl habitat. Several rare species, including the yellow-listed trumpeter swan, which has suffered a significant reduction in range, the blue-listed brant, old squaw and great blue heron, and the red-listed western grebe, have all been recorded in the wetlands. (around the Skeena Estuary)."  <a href="http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf">http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf</a></p> <p>I am concerned on the impacts on the migratory, marine, and songbirds, that will be affected both by direct changes to Digby Island, and the wetlands on Digby Island that provide them with food and habitat. Also the changes to the food sources for birds in the surrounding area, such as changes to the marine life that will affect the birds diet. I don't believe the wide-ranging impacts to the rich Skeena River Estuary have been properly assessed, or how those changes will impact the wider coast and changes to the food supply for other species? What National and Global changes would take place with this severe impact to the Skeena Estuary?</p>	<p>Given the large bird mortality event recorded at the Canaport facility in New Brunswick in 2013, Aurora LNG recognizes the potential for Project flaring to result in changes in bird movement, which can contribute to increased potential for injury or mortality. Potential residual Project effects related to flaring are described in Sections 4.7.5.3 and 4.11.5.3 of the Application.</p> <p>Aurora LNG considered placement options of the flare system within the PDA to reduce potential interaction with migratory birds and to limit the amount of light dispersal that could influence bird movement (Table 1-26). Aurora LNG has committed to several measures to reduce the potential for flaring effects to birds, and to monitor for those effects. As per mitigation 4.5.1, a 30 m riparian buffer will be applied during all Project phases to retain shoreline habitats and limit noise and light dispersal. The buffer is expected to further reduce potential for disturbance to marine species using shoreline and nearshore habitats in Delusion Bay. As part of Mitigation 4.7.13 and 4.7.14, Aurora LNG will provide educational materials to increase awareness of lighting effects of bird and opportunities for reducing light dispersal during sensitive timing periods (e.g., migration, inclement weather); facility staff will document and report bird injury or mortality associated with flaring to provide ongoing monitoring throughout Project operations. Mitigation 4.7.20 outlines that maintenance flaring events will be scheduled during daylight hours to the extent practicable to reduce potential attraction by birds and bats to flare system infrastructure during nocturnal migration or foraging.</p> <p>Sections 4.7.5.2 and 4.11.5.2 of the Application provides a discussion of change in breeding, foraging, staging, and overwintering habitat for terrestrial and marine birds, including species of conservation concern. These sections describe changes in different habitat communities on and adjacent to Digby Island, including change in wetland and estuarine habitat, and the associated residual effects to species from those changes. Table 4.7-10 and 4.11-9 outline the mitigation measures that Aurora LNG has committed to as a means to reduce potential residual effects from change in habitat to terrestrial wildlife and marine birds.</p> <p>Section 4.11.5.2 describes changes in habitat for marine birds and considers changes in marine prey availability, distribution, and health as outlined in Section 4.9 of the Application. For both terrestrial and marine bird species, the characterization of residual effects considers the spatial and temporal extent of Project effects and how they are expected to interact with terrestrial wildlife and marine birds. A residual effect was considered significant if it affects the viability of local or regional terrestrial wildlife or marine bird populations.</p>
88	2017-02-18	Neil Frazer - Powell River, British Columbia	<p>Dear Director, BC EAO,</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposed Aurora LNG Digby Island project because of the threat it poses to migratory birds and nearby salmon habitat.</p> <p>Skeena salmon are essential to BC's coastal and interior ecosystems because of the way they transport marine protein from the high seas to our forests. They therefore deserve our concern and protection.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
89	2017-02-18	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace, British Columbia	<p>I am 100% AGAINST LNG development. British Columbia's nascent LNG industry requires massive amounts of new fracking wells drilled in Northeast BC. This area is currently undergoing rampant development, with little regulation and even less public consultation. Vast amounts of freshwater are siphoned out of the Williston Reservoir, as well as rivers and lakes across the region. Thousands of gallons of toxic waste water will be dumped into underground aquifers, posing a serious threat to freshwater. The area's remaining wilderness areas will be eaten away by clear cuts, road access, pipelines and transmission lines: impacting wildlife corridors, critical habitat and degrading ecosystem integrity. ANYONE WHO UNDERSTANDS FRACKING IS OPPOSED TO IT. If they understand it but still support it, then they must be gaining profit from it. There is no "Grey Area" with fracking. There is nothing good about it. There is no such thing as safe fracking.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
90	2017-02-18	Sunshine Goldsberry	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It is critical to retain and protect wild salmon species and the economy that they support! The Delusion Bay area must be protected without the constant threat of an Ing plant in the habitat..</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sunshine Goldsberry, Coombs  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
91	2017-02-18	Tamara Lorincz	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please Stand up for Skeena salmon: Say no to Aurora LNG!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tamara Lorincz, Saanichton  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

92		Mary Ferraro	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Stop the plans to build a massive fracked gas plant neat Prince Rupert on Digby Island. We do not need more poison in our water and air. In this modern times, we should be divesting from oil and investing in solar energy instead. Solar energy does not pollute and it is infinite. We need to start moving away from oil.</p> <p>This plant does not only going to damage the air and soil, but also emperils the Flora Bank salmon, the habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons, and many song bird species. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b></p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Ferraro, Aurora cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOLE process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.</p>
93		Terry Tedesco-Kerrick	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Terry Tedesco-Kerrick, Phoenix, Arizona 85016-8924 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
94	2017-02-18	Shohre Shirazi	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please save our home and your home our Mother Earth, to live we need clean water and wetland, stop thinking about the money you making know, think future and impact of saving nature and wild animals and birds and Salmon. Please Stop!</p> <p>Sincerely, Shohre Shirazi, Coquitlam cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
95	2017-02-18	Prof. Denise J. Tartaglia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Prof. Denise J. Tartaglia, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
96	2017-02-18	Corrina Parker	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Corrina Parker, Toowoomba cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
97	2017-02-18	cathy kool	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Time's up for looking after our future and the earth's ability to deal with our mess. Protect plants, animals, air and water before the damage is irreparable. Use your noodle, not your greed.</p> <p>Thanks, Cathy Kool Sincerely, cathy kool, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern..</p>
98	2017-02-18	Brad Jones	<p>Dear EAO:</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Please reject it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brad Jones Sincerely, Brad Jones, Edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
99	2017-02-18	Vickey Baker	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Vickey Baker, Harlan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>



100	2017-02-18	Chris Jones	<p>Dear EAO, Consider please to not build a LNG plant for international LNG exportation. This could result in salmon, which sustain not only humans, but many other species, including carbon sequestering ones. This province should be looking into renewable energy instead of bending over to export natural gas and/or use it here in Canada! Look into hydro using an egg-beater-like shape that allows for a natural river flow while producing power.</p> <p>Sincerely, Chris Jones, Fernie cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
101	2017-02-18	Les Sakals	<p>Dear EAO, Salmon are a resource that could last for hundreds of years. It is plain silly to threaten them with a short term development that will only give a few people any benefit. In fact, if all the profits went to the Province of BC they could never reach the benefit that the province and its inhabitants would get from the future salmon runs. Say 'no' to development that threatens our salmon. Say 'yes' to taking care of the environment in a way that will benefit the most people.</p> <p>Sincerely, Les Sakals, Clearwater cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
102	2017-02-18	Meli Fraser	<p>Dear EAO,, I am writing today to ask that you please don't build a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen. It would be built near Prince Rupert , where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. Preserving this fragile wild area is important for the salmon &amp; the northern economy they support. Sincerely,Meli Fraser</p> <p>Sincerely, Meli Fraser, Toronto, Ont. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges and appreciates your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the global LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.
103	2017-02-18	Kathleen Scott	<p>Dear EAO, We don't want fracking in our province, we do not want any more environmental pressure on west coast shoreline habitat. Expanding the use and distribution of fossil fuels is not the way to build British Columbia. What fossil fuels we do produce, should be used to build end use products here in Canada. Preferable products that can be for the benefit of accessing alternate energy, and for long lasting products that are highly recyclable. There is so much waste with fossil fuel usage now. Lets treat it like a precious resource, that most be used sparingly. Not ship it all away to make pollution somewhere else, to make poor quality, disposable 'stuff' to sell back to us, while jeopardizing our home soils.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathleen Scott, Van Anda, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
104	2017-02-18	Christine Weyenberg	<p>Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christine Weyenberg, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.
105	2017-02-18	Chris Wex	<p>Dear EAO, It would be a great disservice to the First Nations People, Canadians and ultimately all people sharing this planet if we continue to open up new carbon fuel deposits, particularly in areas of rich biodiversity. The knock on effects and dangers to people and wildlife associated with fracking, extracting and transporting the product simply does not make sense. We implore you to bring that to the attention of those who would get into bed with the Chinese who have a deplorable track record of violating the environment world-wide, and anyone else who puts short term profit before a healthy planet.</p> <p>Sincerely, Chris Wex, Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

106	2017-02-18	Bruce Van Tassell	Dear EAO, Christy Clark is putting all wildlife in Danger approving one devastating project after another we need real leadership that cares about there being a Province with abundant life for future generations her children. Sincerely, Bruce Van Tassell, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
107	2017-02-18	Nicole Loh	Dear EAO, Stand up for Skeena salmon: Say no to Aurora LNG! I have read articles about it and came across this site that asked for petition : <a href="http://sierraclub.bc.ca/take-action-centre/aurora-lng/">http://sierraclub.bc.ca/take-action-centre/aurora-lng/</a> Please reconsider Sincerely, Nicole Loh, Singapore cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
108	2017-02-18	ELAINE AL MEQDAD	Dear EAO, The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Sincerely, ELAINE AL MEQDAD, IL cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
109	2017-02-18	Theresa Sampson	Dear EAO, Stop the desecration.....before it's too late. Sincerely, Theresa Sampson, New Westminster cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
110	2017-02-18	Andrea Carol Anderson	Dear EAO, No, a thousand times no, to Aurora LNG. I'm with the salmon of Delusion Bay. And our dear ocean and west coast. And the people living there, including First Nations people! Nexen's horrifying proposal threatens salmon and wildlife, community health and safety, and our very climate. Thank you for taking care of stopping this at once. Sincerely, Andrea Carol Anderson, Campbell River, B. C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.
111	2017-02-18	Oliver Osborn	Dear EAO, The first time I saw Prince Rupert was in 1967. It was the spectacular end of the road to the Alaska Ferry, and magnificent in its own right. Over the years, the world has been changing. It is time to move off fossil fuels, stop global warming, and preserve our northern rain forests and salmon resources. I hope that Prince Rupert will not be turned into another industrial zone. It has more value as it is now. Sincerely, Oliver Osborn, Corte Madera cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
112	2017-02-18	Maddie Renaud	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Maddie Renaud, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
113	2017-02-18	Danielle Tran	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Danielle Tran, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
114	2017-02-18	Jay Van Oostdam	Dear EAO, I am writing to you let you know why I oppose the Aurora LNG plant proposed for Digby Island. A plant of this size cannot be put adjacent to Dodge Cove and I believe the international LNG siting guidelines state this quite clearly. The mouth of the Skeena river is only a few kilometres away and a billion salmon fry come out this river each year. The impact that this plant will have on Delusion Bay will render is unsuitable as a rearing ground for Steelhead and other salmon species. The Skeena is one of the jewels of northern BC Please do not allow this plant to be built. Sincerely, Jay Van Oostdam, Comox cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.

115	2017-02-18	Sarah Valentine	Dear EAO, I fully oppose the LNG plant next to Delusion Bay. Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas. Sincerely, Sarah Valentine, Pemberton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
116	2017-02-18	esther muirhead	Dear EAO, If you say you want to protect wild salmon habitat, Aurora LNG has got to be stopped. The LNG industry anywhere supports climate warming and is a step backwards for the health of our planet. Sincerely, esther muirhead, dneman island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
117	2017-02-18	Stephen Weitz	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Stephen Weitz, Oakland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
118	2017-02-18	Dan Fredrick	Dear EAO, I understand that you are considering Nexen's Aurora LNG plant proposal. The plant would be built on Digby Island. My concern is that this plant will be built perilously close to critical salmon habitat in Delusion Bay. But beyond this, Digby Island itself provides habitat for many birds. An LNG is not a small thing that fits gently into the natural environment -- it's a big installation with gas flares that will have a huge impact on the environment. And it doesn't sit in isolation; it requires roads, and of course tankers. These aren't the only reasons the Aurora proposal should be denied - there are many - but they're the ones that matter most to me. This is a beautiful area of Canada. Let's not ruin it with short-sighted greed. We don't need this LNG plant. Thanks, Dan. Sincerely, Dan Fredrick, Edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.
119	2017-02-18	Marilyn Glasgow	Dear EAO, I'm writing to ask that you please do not allow AURORA LNG to tgo in and ravage this Digby Island with their fracked gas plant, thereby destroying the area where salmon travel to get to the ocean. What would you suggest these salmon do? I happen to believe that there has been enough damage done in B.C by these big companies, thanks to Christy Clark, and her thirst for money. Let's think about the environment and animals for a change. Enough is enough. Sincerely, Marilyn Glasgow, London cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
120	2017-02-18	Dominic Baker	Dear EAO, Please no more short sighted decisions! Thousands of years of sustainable salmon fishing in the area ruined for an export plant with a two or three generation lifespan? This is madness. Money madness must be not allowed to cloud our judgement any longer. Please ask yourself - how will your grandchildren judge your decisions? Thank you for your unbiased consideration of public opinion. Sincerely, Dominic Baker, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
121	2017-02-18	David Monk	Dear EAO, I'm writing to express my hope that you will bide scientific calculations that explain the negative impacts of LNG exploitation on the environment both upstream and downstream and the long term ramifications manifested in climate change, water pollution, and habitat destruction of many species, including the communities of people who live in the region. today, I am writing specifically about the proposed Aurora LNG plant. It would smash any possibility of bc reaching it's climate goals, which in itself amounts to a denial of climate change, but it has significant adverse effects on Salmon and counters efforts at reconciliation with first nations. Please do not approve this Sincerely, David Monk, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
122	2017-02-18	Elisabeth Bechmann	DAurora LNG threatens our climate As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.ear EAO, Sincerely, Elisabeth Bechmann, St. P'iten, Austria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
123	2017-02-18	John Moszyk	Dear EAO, Sincerely, John Moszyk, St Louis cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

124	2017-02-18	Peter Posselt	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG or any other LNG plant and the fracking that comes with it must never happen in BCs PNW. As you know, 96 percent of local residents are opposed to this project. The greenhouse gas emissions as well as the contamination that fracking would cause to our groundwater and sensitive fish ecosystems are completely unacceptable. It is a fact that this and all other LNG projects pose a direct risk to our food security, fisheries, community health, and cultural heritage. To steal our children's future to make corporate profits by selling this dirty fossil fuel to a political regime known for its flagrant human rights abuses is a crime against humanity. Get out of our communities and stay out! Sincerely, Peter Posselt, Burns Lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
125	2017-02-18	Marc van de Waarsenburg	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marc van de Waarsenburg, Zierikzee cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
126	2017-02-18	Teresa Wlosowicz	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Teresa Wlosowicz, Sosnowiec cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
127	2017-02-18	patricia martin	Dear EAO,, please do not allow Aurora to build this plant which would poison air, water and soil which put the skeena salmon at risk but sentient creatures and humans as well. Sincerely, patricia martin, ottawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
128	2017-02-18	Neil Lambert	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Neil Lambert, San Francisco, CA cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
129	2017-02-18	Reanna Helin	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Reanna Helin, Nanoose cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
130	2017-02-18	Kate Badger	Dear EAO, We need our lakes and streams for the future of our species survival. Fresh water is life, the fish that live in it is life, gas companies needs can't be the only focus. The planet depends on the choices we make now! The ramifications of the actions that follow are either going to be catastrophic or life saving.....make the right choice for humanity and not for big business. Sincerely, Kate Badger, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
131	2017-02-18	Laura Collins	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Laura Collins, Rancho Cordova cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
132	2017-02-18	Jane Forbes	Dear EAO, The last thing we need on this planet is another gas plant. We need to be investing in renewal resources not more plants that ruin the environment and pollute our water and air. We cannot afford to destroy anymore of our wild spaces. Diversity, plant and animal, is essential to a healthy planet not just for our generation but for generations to come. This plant would destroy wetlands, water ways and local communities. We need to look to the future as well as now. We need to make decisions that will benefit all of us (not just people) but every other living thing on this planet. Please do not build this plant. Please take the money and invest in a clean future for everyone. Sincerely, Jane Forbes, Santa Cruz cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
133	2017-02-18	meghan horan	Dear EAO, Sincerely, meghan horan, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

134	2017-02-18	Helen Ible	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It is extremely concerning to me as a citizen, taxpayer, mother and grandmother that there is any possibility that the proposed Aurora LNG fracked gas plant will be built. To begin it threatens the famous Skeena estuary, where millions upon millions of young salmon migrate each year to the ocean. The plant is to be sited by Delusion Bay-- aptly named if we operate under the delusion that it will not harm the important habitat for sockeye and coho salmon and steelhead as well. the likelihood of damage is at least as great as that posed by the the Petronas operation at Flora Bank.</p> <p>In addition habitat for migrating birds provided by the ancient muskeg on Digby Island will also be gravely endangered by gas flaring along the route travelled by song birds, herons, swans, cranes and ducks and geese. In addition the access road, the construction of the plant itself ,etc. will acidify the air, which in turn will damage the wetlands and their important eel grass nesting areas.</p> <p>All this suggests very negative effects on the wildlife of the area, even the porpoises in the harbour itself. But human habitation is also threatened. The site for the plant would violate international standards and the narrow entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour portends the likelihood of collisions, spills, and tank ruptures.</p> <p>Please, please, please, do not approve this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Helen Ible, Sechelt</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.</p>
135	2017-02-18	Jean Wilkinson	<p>Dear Environmental Assessment Office:</p> <p>Please deny the Aurora LNG proposal near Prince Rupert. Our province's north coast, with its critical salmon habitat, marine life, wetlands, forests, and wildlife, is too important to be placed at risk by this short-sighted, destructive plan.</p> <p>Sustainable economic benefits from the fishing industry and tourism, which depend on a clean, healthy and beautiful natural environment, far outweigh any short-term monetary gains this proposal would bring to BC.</p> <p>Significantly, First Nations rights, concerns and interests have not been addressed, and the informed consent of the local bands has not been given.</p> <p>The proposed location is much too close to the community of Dodge Cove and the city of Prince Rupert, and if built would pose a severe public safety threat. It would also foul the air and water, increase noise and light pollution, and negatively impact residents' quality of life..</p> <p>Having lived in Prince Rupert for five years, I'm familiar with the topography and extreme weather conditions of the area. Because of these, ships carrying LNG in this area would be at a high risk for accidents, with very serious, long-term consequences for the natural environment and human safety.</p> <p>Another reason for my strong opposition is that the natural gas for this proposal would be fracked, which pollutes huge amounts of water and destroys habitats and landscapes over massive areas.</p> <p>The economics of this and other LNG proposals don't make sense for the citizens of B. C. While a few Nexen CEOs and shareholders may make money, it will be at the expense of taxpayers, due to the poorly conceived tax give-aways that have been promised to the industry.</p> <p>Finally, and most importantly, I am totally opposed to proposals such as these that create huge amounts of greenhouse gases. LNG is NOT a clean fuel when its overall carbon footprint is evaluated. Fracking the gas, construction of LNG plants and terminals, shipping the product, and its eventual burning all add unnecessary carbon to the atmosphere, and make fracked LNG as dirty as coal.</p> <p>It's imperative that we in B. C, recognize this fact, and take real steps to meet our legislated climate targets, rather than pursue the folly of LNG. The future of the planet and of our children depends on all of us taking action now to reduce the risks of massive climate disruption.</p> <p>Please recognize this reality, and do your part by denying the Aurora LNG proposal</p> <p>Sincerely, Jean Wilkinson, Salt Spring Island</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As we continue to develop the proposed Aurora LNG Project, safety is our top priority.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is participating in the voluntary TERMPOL process. The recommendations resulting from this process will inform, as appropriate, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Project and will help to further reduce the potential for adverse effects on marine use and navigation. The marine terminal will be designed and built to conform to international standards and best practices for LNG terminals and that includes the SIGTTO standards. However, Canadian and Provincial regulatory requirements which have legal standing will take precedence within this jurisdiction.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.</p>
136	2017-02-18	Sandra Couch	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I do not support any Aurora LNG fracking gas plant due to it threatens the Skeena wild sockeye salmon, steelhead, coho and wildlife including geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons, and songbirds (just to name a few)..</p> <p>Just the fact it is proposed by a foreign owned company and they are a supporter of oil, is reason enough to be very skeptical and negative about this project!!!</p> <p>This plan would allow burning gasses into the air along the migration routes of birds plus acidification of the water &amp; air contaminating the wetlands for the eel, porpoise and other wildlife.</p> <p>This plan is just another nail into the coffin to kill animals without reason, regardless what mankind thinks it will help humans.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sandra Couch, Naperville</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
137	2017-02-18	Joanne Marshall	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Fracking is not the way of the future. Nor is it sustainable in the present. Nature doesn't need us; we need it. Please respect the actual hand (our natural environment) that feeds and do not support the new Nexen project for an Aurora LNG site that would negatively impact our ecosystems and our people.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Marshall</p> <p>Sincerely, Joanne Marshall, Edmonton</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
138	2017-02-18	GRANT AUGUSTUS	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This project would be BC's largest LNG facility to date. This fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year.</p> <p>With the ever increasing production of renewal resource energy which will power the future, why allow this retrograde project to endanger our planet and all the life that calls it home home.</p> <p>Sincerely, GRANT AUGUSTUS, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

139	2017-02-18	Anne Morris	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I write in appeal to you to reject the proposed Aurora LNG plant. The plant would be located on Digby Island, beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon.</p> <p>Digby Island also provides important habit for migrating birds -- geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons, and song birds.</p> <p>A proposed three-lane road, plant construction, and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, and also eel grass habitat that is critically important for juvenile salmon.</p> <p>The plant would also negatively impact local communities, polluting air, drinking water, and soil, while construction blasting and drilling and the 24/7 plant operation would degrade wildlife areas, and also quality of life for local communities, which are 96% opposed to the project according to a 2015 survey.</p> <p>The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms, which raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels, and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site of the plant is within the territory of three First Nation groups, who oppose the proposed plant on the grounds that it poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. Canada is a signatory of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which obligates Canada to obtain the free, prior, and informed consent from the First Nations concerned before any development can take place on their territory.</p> <p>I am greatly concerned that climate change is advancing much more quickly than expected. This proposed fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions annually. At a time when Canada should be promoting our transition to a clean energy economy, this plant would exacerbate fossil fuel dependency.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reject this proposed plant.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anne Morris, Salmon Arm, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
140	2017-02-18	susan castle	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am against the AURORA LNG project. It THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE. as it is planned to be placed in an area which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Sincerely, susan castle, victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
141	2017-02-18	Dory Spencer	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The last of the wild salmon that live on the whole west coast use the Skeen River to spawn and keep the species alive. We cannot ever jeopardize this valuable, priceless wild salmon for all our wildlife, and the people who depend on this food source. To do so is insane.</p> <p>Stop considering any attempt to place such a damaging, volatile, pollutant near this river mouth, the Skeena River.</p> <p>It's time to rethink our pollution of the planet and develop wind and solar options.</p> <p>Thank you Dory Spencer doryspencer@gmail.com Box 746 Masset BC, V0T 1M0 Sincerely, Dory Spencer, Masset cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
142	2017-02-18	Daulton Paynter	<p>Dear EAO, We MUST protect the Skeena River ! It is our duty to stop the destructive damage caused by thr Petonus LNG plant!</p> <p>Sincerely, Daulton Paynter, Ganges, Salt Spring Island, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
143	2017-02-18	Mary Harte	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Salmon have declined along the northwest Pacific, and the proposed Aurora LNG would permanently harm yet another population.</p> <p>It would further promote the accelerated warming being seen already in the Arctic that is harming and disrupting humans and wildlife alike.</p> <p>Its pollution would further harm human and wildlife communities.</p> <p>I urge you, for your children and their legacy, not to build this facility.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Harte, Berkeley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>

144	2017-02-18	Onni Milne	<p>Dear EAO Staff,</p> <p>I send this message to support a NO for a permit to Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Citizens are flooded with messages of phony prosperity coming as a result of this kind of project. Phony because they never account for the full cost of the project in terms of lost or damaged habitat and those who bear the full costs are never the ones who initiated the project.</p> <p>I weep to think of how the area will be decimated if the Aurora LNG plant is approved.</p> <p>The plant is scheduled to be built beside Delusion Bay, critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. BC and this area are known around the world for Salmon. No more, as the ocean is poisoned by Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Muskeg wetlands of the area are habitat for migrating birds - geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring will send burning gasses into the air along migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water will destroy bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise will cause severe impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. How many concerns do you need to hear about before you stop a project?</p> <p>When will Free, Prior and Informed Consent be more than public relations spin to governments that continue the Colonialism of 2017? The First Nations of the area - Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala - depend on these waters for food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. Honour Canada's signature on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Walk the Talk for reconciliation in 2017.</p> <p>Listen to the citizens of the area. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. They know the dangers of this area with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms which will ensure collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>I ask you to show leadership needed to make "Super Natural BC" mean something when resource projects are taking away that reality.</p> <p>SAY NO TO NEXEN AND AURORA LNG NOW.</p> <p>Sincerely, Onni Milne, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
145	2017-02-18	Patricia Fitzgerald	<p>Dear EAO, This will damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Fitzgerald, Mayne Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
146	2017-02-18	Denise Foster	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to add my resounding NO to the proposed Aurora LNG. I have family living in Prince Rupert and have visited many times. My beautiful niece and nephews are counting on you to protect their home</p> <p>This pure, rugged part of BC's incredible coast and the wildlife it supports should not be put at risk.</p> <p>Please, show environmental leadership by not permitting growth in this carbon producing energy. Instead be a leading edge province in the fight against climate change; a role we can be proud of.</p> <p>Sincerely, Denise Foster, Duncan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
147	2017-02-18	Sheila Adams	<p>Dear EAO, the plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sheila Adams, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
148	2017-02-18	Margot Harrison	<p>I believe that the LNG project near Dodge Cove would cause environmental and social destruction. It's time to put the environment first. Climate change is real. Earthquakes and polluted waters are real. Why should people who have chosen to live in a peaceful and scenic area now be subjected to this type of upheaval and disturbance of their surroundings.</p> <p>Why should more wildlife be displaced or destroyed?</p> <p>I do not support this project, or any other LNG project.</p> <p>Margot Harrison Vancouver, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

149	2017-02-18	Colin Leech-Porter	<p>Dear EAO</p> <p><b>,AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>I have read and understand what is proposed for the wetlands around Digby island. and Delusion Bay. There should be concerns also about extensive fracking. . I am expressing my opposition to this development.</p> <p>Sincerely, Colin Leech-Porter, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
150	2017-02-18	Mark Belanger	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Mark Belanger, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
151	2017-02-18	Doreen Dixon	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>There is far more real value in wildlife, food, and water than in still more oil. The technology for alternative sources of power has been developed and is being constantly improved: financial support for research and development of alternative power sources should be a priority, not spending on oil.</p> <p>The science on climate change is clear: fossil fuels need to be phased out. Please do the right thing for the earth and its denizens and stop the development of Aurora LNG!</p> <p>Sincerely, Doreen Dixon, Lunenburg, NS cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>
152	2017-02-18	Lorna Foster	<p>Dear EAO, I say no to aurora Lng. It's time to have a vision for our future and the future of our children. A vision where we are in love with nature and an understanding the we are part of nature and it is nature that provides for us in abundance. we have to say no to anything that will destroy the natural habitat and make clean energy choices. I say as a tax payer that i want my money used to build environmentally friendly ways to fuel our future. Building clean energy sources would create jobs for people to transition to. I say NO to aurora lng.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lorna Foster, Williams Lake, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
153	2017-02-18	Ray James Bradbury	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am completely opposed to the insane proposal Aurora LNG. This is just another trashing of our planet like the equally crazy damage to Flora Bank.</p> <p><b>REJECT THE AURORA LNG PROPOSAL!</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ray James Bradbury, West Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
154	2017-02-18	Najma Cole	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Nexen is proposing to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas.</p> <p>B.C. Salmon is already suffering and this plant would really hurt the salmon population if not destroy it.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Najma Cole, Morinville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
155	2017-02-18	Leslie Withers-Gray	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please do not approve building of Nexen's Aurora LNG gas plant near Prince Rupert. I am deeply concerned about the impacts from this project which would irreversibly damage the coastal environment, further compromises our wildlife and marine life, and significantly put at risk the health, safety and culture of the surrounding communities.</p> <p>We need to respect our First Nations people and honour our commitment to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>Additionally, this project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>There is enough scientific and indigenous knowledge to show approving this project is a mistake. BC is quickly losing status as the "super natural" province with all the industrial projects it is approving. Please don't add another one to this shameful list. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leslie Withers-Gray, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>



156	2017-02-18	julianna raeburn	<p>Dear EAO, Please do NOT approve the Aurora LNG plant that is proposed for Delusion Bay. The building and production would decimate the air, water and lands of this beautiful area and threaten the resources of the local people. I feel like the threats to our environment are spinning madly out of control these days and we have to draw the line somewhere. Please do not contribute to the problem. Many, many thanks &amp; nothing but good wishes to you all... Best, Julianna Raeburn Sincerely, julianna raeburn, victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
157	2017-02-18	Justin Qunn	<p>Dear EAO, I am writing to you today to ask you to please say no the Aurora LNG. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, a very important habitat for salmon species like the steelhead, coho, and sockeye. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. The Tankers that would come to the Terminal will make a lot of noise and this noise will harm the harbour porpoise. Not only will the Aurora LNG threaten wildlife, it will also cause harm to the health and safety of local communities. A 2015 survey showed that 96% of residents were opposed to this project and with good reason. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site for the project lies within territory belonging to first nations peoples such as the Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. These First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting for many centuries. This proposed project will negatively impact food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. Canada is a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and as such it must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Approving this project without the consent of the first nations will be a gross violation of their rights. Another reason to reject the project is that it threatens our climate. Climate change is happening, We are seeing its effects now, all over the world. We need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions not add to them. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year, plus the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow its carbon budget. It is evident that this project will not make British Columbia more prosperous. It will damage the health of the environment and its people. It will also contribute to climate change which is a global crisis. Therefore I ask you to please take into consideration what I said in this letter and say NO to the Aurora LNG. Thank You Sincerely, Justin Qunn, Mount Pearl cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
158	2017-02-18	Robin Abbott	<p>Dear EAO, Please do not let Aurora LNG build a massive fracked gas plant on Digby Island! This carbon bomb must be stopped! Please think about your future, your children's future and mine! Do the right thing and stop letting the all mighty buck be your compass! Sincerely, Robin Abbott, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
159	2017-02-18	Mark Holmes	<p>The Environmental Assessment Office, The proposed Aurora LNG gas plant is yet another unacceptable risk to wildlife, human lives, and planetary climatic concerns. And it represents another missed opportunity to move away forever from an oil and gas-based economy, and over-production of carbon, and towards a permanent clean energy future. It is simply time to stop these types of new proposals and developments, and to no longer even give them consideration. Sincerely, Mark Holmes, Edgewater, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
160	2017-02-18	Leslie Jandreau	<p>Dear EAO, Salmon is a heart healthy food, prized for it's omega-3 oils -- and its great flavor. The availability of clean, unpolluted habitat is rapidly diminishing. and it's, affecting birds and other wildlife as well as salmon. We Canadians have a beautiful country, of which we are rightfully proud. Destroying it for the sake of resources like gas and oil also destroys something in us. That's not progress, especially when it's not clear that we Canadians will receive any real benefit. Jobs? The Chinese have a world-wide history of importing Chinese workers rather than using local workers. More resources for our use? Or will most of it be exported? Please make Canadians and our environment number one and say "NO!" to Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Leslie Jandreau, Keswick cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
161	2017-02-18	Maria Schneider	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Maria Schneider, Munich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

162	2017-02-18	Sonja Nielsen	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sonja Nielsen, Glostrup cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
163	2017-02-18	Jeanine Ponce	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Jeanine Ponce, Montlu'on cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
164	2017-02-18	Sanand D	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sanand D, Louvain-la-Neuve cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
165	2017-02-18	bellinda rolf-jansen	Dear EAO, Sincerely, bellinda rolf-jansen, Oosterbeek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
166	2017-02-18	Nancy Wigen	Dear EAO, I am writing about the proposed Aurora fracked gas plant owned by Nexen , Chinese giant CNOOC near Prince Rupert on Digby Island near the Skeena River estuary. This is essential habitat for a billion young salmon as they begin their migration from the Skeena R. to the open ocean each year. These wild fish are a National Treasure that have nourished and enriched this coast for thousands, maybe millions of years, bringing high quality protein from the ocean to feed everything from humans, bears, birds, orcas, other fish, marine mammals, coastal animals and the forest itself, bringing that protein hundreds of miles inland as they go up the rivers to spawn. This is my heritage and the heritage of my grandchildren and more for the First Nations people who have depended on and protected these fish for thousands of years. How can you consider that you have the right to destroy all this for the benefit of some massive Chinese oil company? Fracking destroys irreplaceable fresh water, and the infrastructure to serve the gas extraction, transportation and export will cause huge environmental disruption and damage, plus this will hasten Climate Change by producing 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gasses per year into the atmosphere. The local residents are opposed to this development, wildlife of all kinds will be seriously impacted. The ocean also will be at risk from increased heavy traffic. And where ever the gas is burned it will increase the pollution of the world wide atmosphere. Already Climate Change is causing extreme weather changes, droughts, floods, fires, crop failures, starvation and human migration out of affected areas adding to the huge refugee crisis. Please say "No" to The Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Nancy Wigen, Salt Spring Island, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
167	2017-02-18	Marie-Jeanne Leduc	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marie-Jeanne Leduc, Salaberry-de-Valleyfield cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
168	2017-02-18	Janelle Pollock	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Janelle Pollock, Montreal cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
169	2017-02-18	Martha Spencer	Dear EAO, Please say NO to Aurora LNG! Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Aurora LNG threatens our climate. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Martha Spencer, Brevard, NC, USA cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.

170	2017-02-18	Kathrin Lang	<p>Dear EAO, it is time that we stop to think only about money. Oil and gas is not the future. We want to be running on green energy globally by 2050. So how shall we achieve that when so many are still setting on oil and gas. Studies have shown, that the renewable energy sector can provide way more jobs than oil and gas. Furthermore, why does Canada continue to put its nature and its resources at stake for international oil and gas companies? Salmon is valuable. It can provide income, feed people and is one of the symbols representing the Canadian West Coast. I therefore ask you to put salmon, nature, and local communities first and leave the gas in the ground, Kind regards, Kathrin (Vancouver was my home for 5 years, and despite living in Europe now, I care. I will always care about Canada!) Sincerely, Kathrin Lang, Oslo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
171	2017-02-18	John ter Borg	<p>Dear EAO, Poorly sited! Again! This is a broken record with these broken projects. Reject it for the same reasons that the Petronas LNG facility will never be built. I expect better than this from a Federal Government that campaigned on restoring Canadian environmental legislation. This country is a bad joke. Sincerely, John ter Borg, Richmond cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
172	2017-02-18	Jason Edgars	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Jason Edgars, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
173	2017-02-18	Joyce Kline	<p>Dear EAO, If ever there was a river to protect in all the world, it is the Skeena and the Skeena estuary. Breathtakingly beautiful and critical to the survival of salmon and countless other species, it is an irreplaceable asset to the coastal First Nations peoples, British Columbia and all of Canada. We cannot afford to squander our precious natural inheritance by risking an estuary of such importance! Sincerely, Joyce Kline, Victoria BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
174	2017-02-18	Margaret Beck	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Margaret Beck, Grosse Pointe cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
175	2017-02-18	Natasha Mauger	<p>Dear EAO, Please listen to your hearts and find your innate connection to nature: We are animals too and our brothers and sisters: the winged ones, the four-legged, the water-borne ones, and all the rest, need us to step up and stop ruining their habitat. Fish stocks have rapidly declined and oceans are toxic. People with power need to harness it for good. Economy is a man-made concept and a waste of time. Fracking releases methane, 20x more destructive than CO2. Oil and gas are always spilt. As leaders, teach us to live in harmony with nature. Imagine a clean future and restore what we have left. Stop selling our precious resources to China. They have already ruined their own lands. Hindsight is a wonderful thing. Sincerely, Natasha Mauger, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
176	2017-02-18	Allisa Bennett	<p>Dear EAO Staff, First I want to thank you on behalf of my great great great great great great grandchildren for all the time and effort you spend thinking about and figuring out how to protect our environment. Assessment is the most important step in any endeavor and must happen first or the whole thing will proceed on false premises. I find I need to assert this over and over again in my work, in my church and in my community. It is a slow, hard, painstaking endeavor...and worth every second it takes. With this in mind I want to thank you most specifically for saying "No" to the Aurora LNG plant. It would break our laws with respect to climate change targets and carbon budgets. It would break our commitments with respect to first nations. It would endanger the health, well-being and livelihoods of the people of the area eventually if not immediately. It would most certainly damage animals, plants, fish and birds. This LNG plant is a perfect example of short term gain for few and long term pain for many. Thank you for pursuing an accurate and comprehensive assessment. Thank you for saying "No". And your 6 times great grandchildren may yet live to thank you. Or they may not thank you but they may live. Warm regards, Sincerely, Allisa Bennett, Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
177	2017-02-18	Linda Vickaryous	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Linda Vickaryous, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

178	2017-02-18	Julia George	<p>Dear EAO, This land is not yours, the water is our life giving source. I do not want the plant anywhere! We live here, not you! We depend on the water and all that lives in it. We do not need your man made disaster here . Furthermore , we do not respect Christy Clark or corporations like yours. Go away. We need our lives intact, we do not need you to cause us damage! Go away. There's bound to be a disaster and you in the corporation know it.. No , we the people will not allow you through! A big fat NO!</p> <p>Sincerely, Julia George, Burnaby Bc cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
179	2017-02-18	Whitney Laughlin	<p>Dear EAO, I want to stand up for the Skeena wild salmon and the northern economy they support. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Whitney Laughlin Sincerely, Whitney Laughlin, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
180	2017-02-18	Philip Ratcliff	<p>Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. EAO, The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would also pollute the air, water, and soil of local communities.</p> <p>Sincerely, Philip Ratcliff, Fort St. John B.C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
181	2017-02-18	Elaine Becker	<p>Dear EAO, We MUST save species for future generations! We must also save the Industry of Salmon Fishing. Much of the local economy is based on the fisheries and the tourism that rely on the unspoiled forests and wildlife. Turning the area into an industrial wasteland KILLS not only the Salmon, but the wildlife and tourism.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elaine Becker, Roanoke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
182	2017-02-18	David Granirer	<p>Dear EAO, No to the Aurora LNG project!!! It will be an environmental disaster and decimate salmon runs.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Granirer, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
183	2017-02-18	Donald Winstone	<p>Dear EAO, Please say no to the Aurora LNG as it will eventually kill millions of Salmon and produce 6.7 million tons of CO2 and not allow BC to meet it Climate change Targets.Do the right thing protect our environment and Mother Earth. You owe it to yourselves , to the citizens of Canada and future generations. Thanks</p> <p>Sincerely, Donald Winstone, Matlock cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

184	2017-02-18	s peirce	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Sincerely, s peirce, lyons cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
185	2017-02-18	Ann Kristoff	Dear EAO, With everything we know about fracking and the dangers to the environment that it poses, this is the most ludicrous project to be proposing. With all the scientific marvels we come up with daily, to constantly be stepping backwards to fossil fuels is unimaginable. Let's move forward to a safe, clean future and protect the magnificent, ancient environment and its inhabitants we have the great fortune to be blessed with. Sincerely, Ann Kristoff, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
186	2017-02-18	Michael Mahoney	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Michael Mahoney, Langley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
187	2017-02-18	Anne Langley	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Anne Langley, edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
188	2017-02-18	Karen Greenspan	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG plant threatens community health and safety as well as area wildlife. Just say, "No." With concern, Karen Greenspan Sincerely, Karen Greenspan, New York cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
189	2017-02-18	chelsey blanc	Dear EAO, Sincerely, chelsey blanc, victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
190	2017-02-18	silvia hall	Dear EAO, Sincerely, silvia hall, boca raton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
191	2017-02-18	Lynn Maxted	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a step in the wrong direction for BC, Canada and the world. We have to address climate change for future generations now! Any expansion of fossil fuel extraction and use will increase greenhouse gas emissions. Please put a stop to this project. Sincerely, Lynn Maxted, Fanny Bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
192	2017-02-18	Gary Wilkinson	Dear EAO, Leave it to the CEO'S and they will have us looking like every other third world country that they have been in. Surely there must be some other place to build this instead of on one of the best salmon rivers left in the world..I thought Christie was going to save us from any more of this oh well maybe they are contributing to the coming election. Sincerely, Gary Wilkinson, Pr. Geo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
193	2017-02-18	Dalile OUAL	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Dalile OUAL, Paris cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
194	2017-02-18	Julie Koehn	Dear EAO, Please do not build the Aurora LNG plant near critical habitat for coho, steelhead and sockeye salmon. We need the salmon for ourselves and future generations. The plant also threatens migrating birds and other wildlife. Community health and safety are also put at risk. Sincerely, Julie Koehn, Maple Ridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

195	2017-02-18	C G	Dear EAO, Sincerely, C G, SAN DIEGO cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
196	2017-02-18	Jon LeBaron	Dear EAO, The importance of Salmon and our/their environment being healthy and in balance, is of obvious and crucial importance! That this information has been presented to you multiple times and you continue to ignore and disregard anything but your exploitive, seemingly profitable, corporate agenda! This is very frighteningly, disturbing because there is no measure of sanity, logic, care being shown/expressed by you and your actions for anything besides your corporate agenda which, when ultimately is fulfilled, has destroyed the Earth; the only Home we all have! Insane!, dangerous!, madness!, STOP! Sincerely, Jon LeBaron, Denman Is. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
197	2017-02-18	Dany C't	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Dany C't, Val David cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
198	2017-02-18	Kenneth Robertson	Dear EAO The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern., Sincerely, Kenneth Robertson, Kansas City cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
199	2017-02-18	Kurt Thiele	Dear EAO, AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Sincerely, Kurt Thiele, Pitt Meadows cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
200	2017-02-18	john pasqua	Dear EAO, DUMP THIS PROPOSED GAS PLANT NEXEN AT PRINE RUPERT ON DIGBY ISLAND TODAY. BAD FOR THE SALMON. Sincerely, john pasqua, Escondido San Diego County cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
201	2017-02-18	Katy Basso	Dear EAO, Please make sure this one goes ahead. I want jobs in my community, I want prosperity Keep in mind that the opposition speaks the loudest. Those of us that are truly invested and involved in the community (volunteers, homeowners, business owners,parents) want to see this project go ahead. Sincerely, Katy Basso, Prince Rupert cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.

202	2017-02-18	Peter Kerr	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I write to you to urge you to reject the application by Nexen to build Aurora LNG, a huge fracked gas plant on Digby Island near Prince Rupert. If built, this plant would be beside Delusion Bay which is a habitat zone crucial for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. These salmon would be adversely affected by the pollution from the plant.</p> <p>Digby Island has muskeg wetlands which provide important habitat for geese, ducks, swans great blue herons, sandhill cranes and song birds. Burning gases would be sent into the air along their migration routes.</p> <p>The noise from tankers associated with the LNG plant would impact harbour porpoises.</p> <p>Besides these negative effects on wildlife, Aurora LNG would pollute the air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Blasting and drilling during construction would significantly impact the communities from noise, light, air and water pollution. The plant would be built under a kilometre from Dodge Cove, a violation of international siting standards. A 2015 poll found that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaasla Traditional Territories are where the proposed site for the plant is located. These First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and harvesting food. Canada has signed the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This requires that Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project.</p> <p>If built, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year, excluding emissions during construction and in shipping and burning the fuel in Asia. As a result B.C.'s climate targets would not be met.</p> <p>I again urge you to reject the application.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Peter Kerr, Kelowna</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p> <p>As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
203	2017-02-18	Eddie Gardner	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Wild salmon are endangered and all precautionary measures are needed to protect them from going extinct, causing devastating impacts on the local economy. In addition, the fracking industry will only accelerate climate warming resulting in BC's legislated climate targets being seriously compromised, and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Eddie Gardner, Chilliwack</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p> <p>As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
204	2017-02-18	Marie Cadorette	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>BC salmon breeding grounds are under threat of extinction. The proposed fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert on Digby Island is a serious threat to our salmon. As well as the threat to salmon, Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. Tanker noise would also seriously disturb harbour porpoise and other marine animals.</p> <p>As well as permanently damaging the environment and the creatures dependent on the environment, the proposed plant will have a direct negative effect on the way of life of the First Nations Peoples who live in that region.</p> <p>Further to the above objections, the Aurora LNG fracked gas plant proposed by Nexen is owned by the Chinese oil giant CNOOC. I feel the peoples of Prince Rupert, the peoples of British Columbia and the peoples of Canada would be handing over some portion of our sovereignty to a foreign country. In allowing such a project, we stand to loose control over our natural resources, our environment and our sovereignty.</p> <p>Sincerely, Marie Cadorette, Duncan</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p> <p>As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
205	2017-02-18	Judy Krach	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Judy Krach, Hazel Crest</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
206	2017-02-18	Sylvia Gray	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Sylvia Gray, Shawnigan Lake</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

207	2017-02-18	Charlotte Stahl	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbor porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Sincerely, Charlotte Stahl, Gresham</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
208	2017-02-18	Martha W D Bushnell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Martha W D Bushnell, Louisville</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
209	2017-02-18	ruth jacobs	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, ruth jacobs, youbou</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>.Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
210	2017-02-18	Ellen Koivisto	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens both salmon and the wildlife and the ecosystem that depend on a healthy salmon population. Gas flaring would disrupt migration routes. A 3-lane road and the plant construction itself would lead to acidification of the air and water and damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat, bird nesting areas, and block bird migration routes. Tanker noise would deafen the harbor porpoise. Additionally, the human residents would suddenly be living in a polluted community with 24/7 noise and light and traffic. That's why 96% of the local residents oppose the project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ellen Koivisto, San Francisco</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
211	2017-02-18	Barbara Lowe	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The environment has to be protected for the good of everyone! Salmon,wildlife and humans are being put at risk. This is not neccesay.!</p> <p>Sincerely, Barbara Lowe, Sechelt</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
212	2017-02-18	Marvin Hayens	<p>Dear EAO</p> <p>We don't need any Liquefied natural gas Plants anywhere in B.C. To start with it is not a good fuel for the environment I guess it burns fairly cleanly; but it takes HUGE AMOUNTS OF ELECTRIAL POWER to cool the stuff down to a liquid state.</p> <p>So all this talk about it being good or economical is just so much B.S.</p> <p>Sincerely, Marvin Hayens, Prince George B.C.</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
213	2017-02-18	Jean Le Marquand	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Nexen should be prohibited from building a massive fracked gas plant on Digby Island as this area is too close to where salmon head each year. To do so, would be extremely hazardous to the wildlife such as geese, ducks and other wild birds. Further construction of roads would only add to the unleashing of this ecological time-bomb.</p> <p>Drinking water and previous eco systems should never be trumped by greedy profit-seekers.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jean Le Marquand, Laval</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
214	2017-02-18	Marc Boyd	<p>Marc Boyd</p> <p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please do the right thing and lets hold on to our natural environment and not go ahead with this plant. Instead, focus on cleaner energy options.</p> <p>Marc Boyd</p> <p>Sincerely, Marc Boyd, Parksville</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>



215	2017-02-18	Linda Mandala	Dear EAO, I am totally opposed to permitting the Aurora LNG plant to be build newt Prince Rupert on Digby Island. This is critical salmon habitat...we have so few places left for any wildlife to live...this would be a disaster waiting to happen. We need to STOP FRACKING COMPLETELY...and stop using fossil fuels as well. We need to switch immediately to electric cars and clean energy or we are all toast...this includes your children as well as mine. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PLANT!! Sincerely, Linda Mandala, Winlaw cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
216	2017-02-18	Janet Fairbanks	Dear EAO, I oppose the proposed Aurora LNG plant because it is a threat to wild salmon, clean air, water and soil in the surrounding area. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. Sincerely, Janet Fairbanks, Courtenay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. \Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
217	2017-02-18	Marty Bostic	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marty Bostic, Ottawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
218	2017-02-18	danuta radko	Dear EAO, Sincerely, danuta radko, tewksbury cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
219	2017-02-18	Diane Shaughnessy	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Diane Shaughnessy, Tacoma cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
220	2017-02-18	Janet Parkins	Dear EAO, Please know that I am opposed to the proposed Aurora LNG plant on Digby Island. The LNG plant would threaten salmon and wildlife, community health, our climate and our survival on this (our only) planet. Thank you for your consideration of this critically important matter. Sincerely, Janet Parkins, Coldstream cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
221	2017-02-18	Friday Bailey	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Friday Bailey, salmon arm cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
222	2017-02-18	Annie Wei	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Annie Wei, Queenslnad cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
223	2017-02-18	Michelle Wells	Deai EAO,, I hold this area of bc very close to my heart. I have loved it since I first ventured there, 35 years ago. I think that it is the most stunnian and fracking, especially part of the provincecrease, it will set off a chain reaction . I am very worried about the wild salmon stock and the effects an lng plant plus fracking would have on them. If the wild salmon stock decreases, due to sickness or destroyed habitat, bears, whales, seals and other animals would be negatively affected - as well first nations people would be negatively affected. I ask that you please re think about the plans for the lng plants and fracking, especially in the skeena river area. Please consider placing environmental and habitat protection first, over economics. Thank you very much! Sincerely, Michelle Wells Sincerely, Michelle Wells, Kamloops cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
224	2017-02-18	Eileen pedersen	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Eileen pedersen, Trail cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

225	2017-02-18	VIRGINIA MENDEZ	<p>Dear EAO,  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b>  The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.  Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>  The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.  The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.  The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.  Sincerely,  VIRGINIA MENDEZ, Hollywood  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.  Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
226	2017-02-18	Robin Shackleton	<p>Dear EAO,  Please don't build another project which sacrifices our natural wealth. A healthy river, estuary and coastal ecosystem is far more important than an LNG plant.  Sincerely,  Robin Shackleton, errington  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
227	2017-02-18	Nancy Crozier	<p>Dear EAO,  I am alarmed that the First Nations concerns have not been respected over Petronas LNG plant on Flora Bank of the Skeena River estuary where salmon , migrating birds, and marshlands sustain their way of life. This is another example of colonial oppression that no matter how many sincere words are said by the Prime Minister and Christy Clark we still find them siding with Big Oil corporations over the environment and Indigenous Peoples. LNG requires infrastructure and refining costs that make the product cost more than the revenues in a failing LNG marketplace. And so much of it is subsidized by the tax payers.  I implore this government to listen to Indigenous People and reliable market intelligence and stop this rush to resource strip our beautiful province and shore up the LNG corporations at our expense. What a loss it will be when our wild salmon are gone!  Stop the Petronas plant.  Thank you  Sincerely,  Nancy Crozier, Gabriola  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
228	2017-02-18	Vicki Sherwood	<p>Dear EAO,  I am totally against the Aurora LNG fracked gas plant proposal. It endangers critical habitat for steel-head, coho and sockeye salmon and important habitat for migrating birds, e.g. geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. Plant construction would create noise, light, air and water pollution. The plant would contaminate the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. The plant also endangers the traditional fishing grounds of local indigenous people. This fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year, which would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget Under no circumstances should Aurora LNG be built.  Sincerely,  Vicki Sherwood, Orillia  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.  Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
229	2017-02-18	Roger Richardson	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Roger Richardson, Osoyoos  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

230	2017-02-18	M Sawada	Dear EAO, Stop. Stop the Aurora LNG. Environmental health, wild life in the sky, on land, and in the sea are far more important. We can find a better way to make money for everyone. We need to have a long range plan. Sincerely, M Sawada, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
231	2017-02-18	judith hazelton	Dear EAO, Please do not allow damage long term damage of this area for short term gain. Sincerely, judith hazelton, bennington cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
232	2017-02-18	Elsie Dean	Dear EAO, Not another LNG plant on the West Coast. I have just learned that a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. If this fracked gas plant is built it will destroy a valuable fish and bird habitat. Governments cannot keep on allowing industry to destroy our food chain. Global warming is already causing food shortages and we must protect, not destroy what we have. Fracking gas and producing LNG increase global warming by releasing greenhouse gases ' CO2 and Methane. This LNG plant must not be built Sincerely, Elsie Dean, Burnaby cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
233	2017-02-18	Lenore Reeves	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Lenore Reeves, Mokena cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
234	2017-02-18	Levi Gingras-fox	Dear EAO, I stand strongly against the proposed project which will endanger vital eco-systems. Fracking itself is destructive to the environment in so many different ways. I fear of chemicals leaching into the stream and ground water causing irreversible damage. Please do extremely detailed research into the environmental impacts before making any form of decision. Thank you, Levi Gingras-Fox Sincerely, Levi Gingras-fox, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
235	2017-02-18	David Haynes	Dear EAO, Your profits are going to ruin our oceans and fish. They methods are unproven and dangerous in so many ways. I say no to you. Sincerely, David Haynes, Nanoose Bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
236	2017-02-18	Sharon Gillespie	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sharon Gillespie, Austin cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
237	2017-02-18	Betty Shaw	Dear EAO, It is time that planners of LNG (or any other development that infringes on local people and their environment ) wake up and realize that altering the land and water around a development has a huge impact on many living things in around and beside that development. Further, human population clusters should not be tampered with. Such an example is the wrongly planned development of the LNG Aurora plant the developers wish to build beside Delusion Bay near Digby Island in the Prince Rupert area. Do cease and desist with any further plans for this wrong development. Begin a new approach which considers the well being of people and their environment first. Betty Shaw Sincerely, Betty Shaw, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
238	2017-02-18	Elizabeth Campbell	Dear EAO, I care about the same Skeena salmon that are threatened by Petronas using fracked gas built near Prince Rupert. It is right next door to Delusion Bay. This provides critical habitat for salmon. It is a valuable area and would be disastrous. Sincerely, Elizabeth Campbell, Port Moody, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

239	2017-02-18	Warwick Neal	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Aurora LNG threatens our climate. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Say no to Aurora LNG! Sincerely, Warwick Neal, Maybeury, WV cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges and appreciates your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen these potential impacts. As we work through the assessment and design process, Aurora LNG will continue to look for opportunities to reduce our project's potential environmental effects and improve operating efficiency through design and engineering practices, the use of technology, and by leveraging the global LNG experience of the project partners. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the global LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
240	2017-02-18	Angelia Milanovic	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Angelia Milanovic, Verdun cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
241	2017-02-18	Kathy Kossen	<p>Dear EAO, Please accept my sincerest objection to the fraced gas plant being proposed by Nexen - especially because it owned by the Chinese. Not even Canadian, not protecting our environment at all. When will we quit bending over to other foreign countries continually trying to rape our environment - when it is all gone??? Will we never learn that our most important environmental resources and protecting all wildlife from the continual exploitation is going to be the ruination of our society and province. They will take what they can and just walk away after all the damage has been done and then we are stuck with the total anihalation of of our beautiful resources and wildlife gone gone gone. I am so tired of having to continually write these protest letters and I will await with anticipation to see who wins out - greed or protection. It will be all gone and will no one care???</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathy Kossen, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
242	2017-02-18	Dianne Varga	<p>Dear EAO: I fear I'm living in a Canadian dystopia where regardless of what scientists, First Nations, economists, or communities say, oil and gas projects and related infrastructure take precedence over facts, evidence, reasoned argument, and Indigenous and treaty rights. In that regard, I'm afraid the proposed Aurora LNG project will be no different from Pacific NorthWest LNG. Both projects will put the same salmon at risk and disturb bird and porpoise populations by compromising their habitats. Both projects will depend on fracked gas and fracking ' an industrial process that's associated with water waste and water contamination, earthquakes, and human illness. Both projects will produce, upstream and downstream, unsustainable levels of carbon emissions. Both will pose direct risks to food security, community health and cultural heritage; and both, according to international law, will require the unambiguous consent of First Nations prior to approval. In addition to these concerns, anyone promoting LNG is out of touch with energy economics ' with the global supply glut of LNG and with plunging prices. Moreover, policy analysts have found time and time again that there are more jobs to be had in renewables than in fossil fuels. Blue Green Canada ' a strategic alliance between the United Steelworkers, Environmental Defence, Unifor, the Columbia Institute, the Pembina Institute, the Broadbent Institute, and Clean Energy Canada ' has found that for every million dollars invested, fifteen jobs can be created in clean energy, whereas only two can be created in oil and gas. The only thing that can explain the senseless pursuit of fossil fuels over the rational pursuit of clean energy is the capture of Canada's political class by the oil and gas industry. Their capture in turn puts political pressure on entities such as your own, the Environmental Assessment Office. In writing to you today, I'm asking you to prove your neutrality by resisting the political pressure put on you to approve this project. Follow science, follow First Nations, and follow economic rationality. Do not give Aurora LNG your stamp of approval.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dianne Varga, Penticton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
243	2017-02-18	Doug Chepil	<p>Dear EAO, We know that those who have the gold make the rules. Doing the right thing has left the building. Hard to find people with guts who even knows what the right thing is anymore. Hope all of this changes and we do not let those with the gold influence the decision making process in this province. The ones who gain the most from this financially do not care about the land. If you think they do you do not understand them.</p> <p>Thanks Doug Chepil Sincerely, Doug Chepil, Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
244	2017-02-18	lydia garvey	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, lydia garvey, clinton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

245	2017-02-18	Danielle Code	Dear EAO, No pipelines, no tankers, no fossil fuel expansion. Our environment is not worth your profits. Sincerely, Danielle Code, Prince George cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
246	2017-02-18	Charlene Simon	EAO, I am writing to strongly object to Nexen's (a Chinese owned company) proposal to build an LNG plant on Digby Island. First of all, according to our Prime Minister, this is supposed a new era of partnering with Indigenous Peoples. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. You are employed to represent the people, not corporations. Instead of adding to global warming and climate change, forcing an unwanted project onto people and putting another healthy environment at risk, why not shift gears altogether and join forces to convince our Federal Government to take the current fossil fuel subsidies and move them to green, sustainable projects. This way Canada really does something about JOBS, CLIMATE CHANGE, INDEPENDENT ENERGY AND FIRST NATIONS. WIN WIN WIN WIN You have to like that! Be visionaries. Do something important for your country with the power and trust given to you. Make your kids proud! Sincerely, Charlene Simon, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
247	2017-02-18	Donna French	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Donna French, Powell river cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
248	2017-02-18	Karin Demidoff	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Karin Demidoff, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
249	2017-02-18	Mat Hanson	Dear EAO, The small amount of jobs and the dwindling price of gas, combined with the potential harm to the environment, fish stocks and local tourism does not suggest this project is viable nor does it pass the cost benefit analysis to BC. I urge you to not approve it and to push the government towards jobs and growth in the renewable energy industry and projects that will not jeopardize BC's environment and the valuable tourism that depends on it. Thank you. Mat Hanson Kelowna, BC Sincerely, Mat Hanson, Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
250	2017-02-18	David Knight	Dear EAO, As an angler I look upon the Skeena watershed as a place that I would like to visit. It has had a reputation as being among the best waters in Canada for trout and salmon in North America. Putting this at risk in order to supply other nations with gas that is taken from the ground by a method which risks fouling underground aquifers and produces toxic waste water that also endangers the water supply is, in a word, stupid. At a time when we are trying to reduce our carbon foot print the money that would be invested in an LNG plant makes no sense. Invest the money in renewable energy. Should this project go ahead, I, and many other anglers like me will not be coming to BC to spend our money. Sincerely, David Knight, Guelph cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
251	2017-02-18	Anna Louise E. Fontaine	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Anna Louise E. Fontaine, Lantier, QC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
252	2017-02-18	Lynn Daoust	Dear EAO, I am a concerned British Columbian. I cannot picture a huge LNG plant in this pristine area. It just doesn't fit! This is explosive stuff and surely we can consider campaigns to teach conservation rather than the increased consumption of liquefied natural gas and other fossil fuels. I fear for my grandchildren's future. Thank You for reading Sincerely, Lynn Daoust, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

253	2017-02-18	Crystal Bee	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Crystal Bee, Alert Bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
254	2017-02-18	Kate Kenner	Dear EAO, A Chinese oil giant is going to make millions from a toxic tracking gas plant in your country. While he is making all this money your country will be polluted and salmon will be the ones who suffer the most. Why would this be allowed to occur? How is it that ethics and the health of your country and salmon who are such an important part of the ecosystem will come AFTER the Chinese billionaire and money? I do not mean to sound rude but this is a very bad plan in many ways and I can only hope that it will be cancelled. Sincerely, Kate Kenner, Guilford cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
255	2017-02-18	Joan Edwards	Dear EAO, We keep hearing from our government about climate change control. So how do they plan to do this? By charging higher taxes so that the average consumer pays more now than ever. The bite is on the little guy. Meanwhile they want to double/triple up on more fossil energy instead of putting the money into renewable sources. And if China owns Aurora then we are screwed. Right? Don't let it happen. Sincerely, Joan Edwards, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
256	2017-02-18	carolyn massey	Dear EAO, please protect the salmon and its habitat we only have one earth and we need to transition to clean energy not more fossil fuel Sincerely, carolyn massey, quincy cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
257	2017-02-18	Cathy Fortin	Dear EAO, it would be a horrid waste of our resources to establish more natural gas infrastructure. The future of LNG is so absolutely uncertain. Rightly so, we need to find energy sources that are less detrimental to British Columbia and the whole earth's health. I realize that it is hard to make a person understand when their salary depends on their not understanding but we cannot continue down this poison path. Please stop this completely detrimental project and let's all move on to a healthier and saner way to live. Thank you. Sincerely, Cathy Fortin, Prince George cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
258	2017-02-18	eric nysten	Dear EAO, Sincerely, eric nysten, silverspring cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
259	2017-02-18	Laura Krause	Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Laura Krause, Boca Raton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.

260	2017-02-18	Elaine Esteban	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The Canadian Government acknowledges that climate change is a real danger and has made promises to curb our dependence on fossil fuels, and yet we continue to invest in carbon projects. We do not need another LNG project. We need to move BC and Canada to a more sustainable energy source.</p> <p>Not only is this project an investment in the wrong direction, it comes at a huge cost to BC's salmon populations. It does not have the approval of the local population and it threatens the traditional food supply of first nations.</p> <p>I am wholly against this project. Move British Columbia towards a sustainable future that will provide for my children and grandchildren, not line the pockets of gas companies and foreign conglomerates.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elaine Esteban, Port Coquitlam cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
261	2017-02-18	Brant Kotch	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Brant Kotch, Houston cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
262	2017-02-18	Karsten Wall	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Salmon populations are on the decline all over North America. Now they're only safe haven is in Alaska and BC's north coast. As a species at risk, the last thing they need is more disruption and pollution in this habitat too. Please consider rejecting this project to help preserve BC's wild salmon.</p> <p>Sincerely, Karsten Wall, Winnipeg cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
263	2017-02-18	Anthony Montapert	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am opposed to Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anthony Montapert, Ventura cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
264	2017-02-18	Stacey McCausland	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Isn't it about time that we stopped putting money and foreign interests ahead of the survival of our planet? Perhaps I'm naively optimistic but I somehow continue to believe that your organizations role is to protect our environment from this type of threat. Our oceans are dying. This is the very last thing they need and it is simply wrong. Fracking is wrong. I know you all know that in your hearts, so stop bowing to the pressure of the corporate lobby and do the right thing. Please.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stacey McCausland, Powell River cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
265	2017-02-18	PR Brown	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This project should definitely NOT proceed any further!</p> <p>The land under threat is a very sensitive area--for birds, fish and all other creatures living in or close to wetlands. Our wetlands are disappearing at an alarming rate all over the province and they are a key component of healthy lungs for the environment.</p> <p>What has happened to our pride about being Super Natural BC? There is nothing to be proud of with this development.</p> <p>And please don't say we need the jobs--the jobs will be minimal--and in the health of BC's environment that is a very short term vision.</p> <p>Sincerely, PR Brown, Powell River cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
266	2017-02-18	Cole McLeod	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Why should we have to put up with people who don't pay attention to lessons already learned elsewhere.</p> <p>Your desire to make money should not become the grave hazard for everyone else to bear and suffer.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cole McLeod, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
267	2017-02-18	jana Ronne	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, jana Ronne, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

268	2017-02-18	Alexis Kellum-Creer	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I write in the hopes that you will not permit the Aurora gas plant to be built on Digby Island or indeed anywhere in BC. Such a plant will impact wetland animal habitats and threaten the surrounding habitable environment with water and air pollution, and the emissions resulting from such a plant would utterly rout Canada's climate targets and make a mockery of our environmental commitments. Most significantly, as a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain consent from First Nations before approving the project, without which the project should not be approved. Let us instead turn our considerable scientific expertise to helping Canada be a global example of forward-thinking energy alternatives, shutting down destructive and unsustainable energy sourcing for good, and protecting this precious and irreplaceable planet for future generations. Let us honour our environment and our indigenous peoples - please do not approve this plant. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alexis Kellum-Creer, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
269	2017-02-18	Cindy Dennison	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Climate leaders don't build pipelines. In recent years, Climate change has been accelerating. Canada has made many promises at Global Climate summits yet the actions of political leaders continue to drive us toward a warming planet. The ice sheets in the poles are showing increasing cracking yet you persist in thinking that a market for LNG needs to be captured - a market that appears to be dwindling and public push for renewable energy is growing. Politicians are not listening to the public, its seems.....only to corporate greed. Please stop. For you children and mine, we need to trend to renewable energy now.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cindy Dennison Sincerely, Cindy Dennison, victoria bc cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
270	2017-02-18	Beverley McKeen	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I do not believe the choice of area for Nexen to build Aurora is sensible in any way. This is salmon habitat and salmon is the backbone of the BC coast. Any risk in this area is just plain stupidity. You have to stand up, do the right and honourable thing, and do not approve this project. I am against it, whole-heartedly. I am trusting you are listening. As a 60 year old, I have a say. Beverley McKeen, North Cowichan resident of 40 years.</p> <p>Sincerely, Beverley McKeen, Duncan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
271	2017-02-18	Susan Jones	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I urge rejection of this project as it will destroy and degrade vital habitats of fragile interdependent, interactive ecosystems. The project has questionable economic benefits and will have devastating social and environmental consequences..</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Jones, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
272	2017-02-18	Karen Hood-caddy	<p>Dear EAO,,</p> <p>This is an important chance to stand up and safeguard the Skeena wild salmon and I hope you do. Our fish supplies are crucial for human and animal survival. Please don't compromise them.</p> <p>Sincerely, Karen Hood-caddy, bracebridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
273	2017-02-18	Caroline S'villa	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Caroline S'villa, Champs-sur-marne cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
274	2017-02-18	garry gallagher	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Protecting the Skeena estuary is paramount to the well being of wild salmon habitat, First Nation peoples and all British Colombians. Fracking is highly controversial and we all know the world is facing an unprecedented ecological challenge from human hubris. Thank you for listening and taking a stand now. Tomorrow will be too late.</p> <p>Sincerely, garry gallagher, vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
275	2017-02-18	Cecilie Davidson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The last thing the Skeena Salmon need is a fracked gas plant near them. Why on Earth build that in today's evolving carbon lowering environment. And to a foreign owned company? Madness.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cecilie Davidson, Qualicum Beach, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
276	2017-02-18	bernardo alayza mujica	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, bernardo alayza mujica, surquillo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>



277	2017-02-18	Janet Baker	<p>Dear EAO, The Skeena Watershed is one of the last remaining major life sustaining watersheds in the North Pacific providing sustenance to most of the people, and the health of the timber and wildlife in the entire Skeena Region. What is the rationale for risking all this for something that has several suitable sites away from both the Skeena and Fraser watersheds? What kind of madness is this? The carbon industry is a cyclical, high risk and pathogenic industry that is falling out of favor fast. Please don't allow the short term gains blind us to the risks and side effects of this completely unwholesome decision. The Skeena and Fraser fisheries, and the timber produced by healthy watersheds has built and sustained British Columbia. Let us please wake up from whatever influence we're under and protect this most important of all our resources.</p> <p>Regards, Janet Baker Sincerely, Janet Baker, Masset cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
278	2017-02-18	Alvin Hamm	<p>Dear EAO, I am opposed to Aurora LNG in Prince Rupert because of the damage it will cause to salmon habitat. Also because it will dramatically increase BC's greenhouse gas emissions. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Alvin Hamm, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
279	2017-02-18	Frank Dalziel	<p>Dear EAO, I care about the Skeena salmon that are threatened by the Petronas fracked gas plant. And now Nexen is proposing to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. This is too much for me to comprehend! Aurora LNG could pose risks that are very similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is just adding more industry to an area that cannot stand any more habitat destruction! BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is very bad news for fish, wildlife, and wetland habitat, In addition, these plants threaten our climate and the health and safety of local and distant communities. I am fed up with the gold-rush mentality of the companies who want to strip our non-renewable resources, then move elsewhere to let this generations children bear the brunt of their folly. I am 100% against this project and will actively cast my vote and encourage others to do the same against any government that allows this folly to continue.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sincerely, Frank Dalziel, Lantzville, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
280	2017-02-18	Croitene ganMoryn	<p>Dear EAO, BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. Sincerely, Croitiene ganMoryn, Ocala cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
281	2017-02-18	Laura Wilder	<p>Dear EAO, I am opposed to the building of Aurora LNG gas plant beside Delusion Bay near Prince Rupert on Digby Island for many reasons. It threatens salmon and wildlife. It threatens community health and safety. It threatens our climate.</p> <p>The burning gasses, acidification of the air and water, as well as the tanker noise from Aurora LNG activity threatens precious salmon and other wildlife. Delusion Bay provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon. It is also an important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans and great blue herons. Putting this fracked gas plant on Digby Island is tantamount to destroying this beautiful and important place.</p> <p>The plant would also impact the air, water, and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling not to mention the continuous operation of the plant and the associated infrastructure would create horrendous impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for the local residents.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometer from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tons of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Putting the Aurora LNG on Prince Rupert and Digby Island is an incredibly bad idea. What on earth possessed you to even think about doing this?! Don't do it!</p> <p>Sincerely, Laura Wilder, Garland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
282	2017-02-18	Wayne Seibel	<p>Dear EAO, This is not the right area for a LNG port. Protect the Salmon runs!! Sincerely, Wayne Seibel, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

283	2017-02-18	Maggi Cheetham	Dear EAO, Salmon are an important cornerstone species for British Columbia both culturally and for plant and animal health and sustainability. By building the Aurora LNG plant beside Delusion Bay, you are threatening the air, water, and land and all that exist there. Sincerely, Maggi Cheetham, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
284	2017-02-18	Walter Bock	Dear EAO, For many reasons, Prince Rupert is a very bad place to build a large commercial oil port. Aside from the effects that it would have on wildlife, the water ways are difficult and dangerous for large oil tankers. Sincerely, Walter Bock Sincerely, Walter Bock, Tenafly cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
285	2017-02-18	Stephen Chessor	Dear EAO, Please do not approve Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Stephen Chessor, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
286	2017-02-18	craig conn	Dear EAO, Sincerely, craig conn, pgh cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
287	2017-02-18	Odilia Leal-McBride	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Odilia Leal-McBride, Austin cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
288	2017-02-18	anne veraldi	Dear EAO, Sincerely, anne veraldi, sf cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
289	2017-02-18	Gord Longley	Dear EAO, To those seriously concerned and claim to have somewhat of an open mind. I'd like to expound a bit on my vies into what humanity really is and what our focus should be. NOTE: This is just a personal opinion. Many others feel differently. I totally respect that. Humanity is all living things. We are somewhere between the bugs at our feet and the mountaintop. Only there is our rightful place. Many living things and future generations have no voice. some of us try to speak for them at the negotiation table. Every living thing has a purpose. When we begin to understand this respect will follow and less and less will we waste valuable time blaming each other. Just some thoughts. #spiritualrevolution #noextremism - G - Sincerely, Gord Longley, SALMON ARM cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
290	2017-02-18	Jason doucette	Dear EAO, Salmon have been the most sustainable resource in the Skeena Watershed for thousands of years. All components of the LNG project increase the risk of long term destruction of a valuable resource that provides me and others in the fishing industry with a successful way of life. Why is your project so much more important than our communities lifestyle. There is no compromise and little to gain from your actions please cease your LNG activities. Regards, North Central Alberta Fly Fishing Sincerely, Jason doucette, SpruceGrove cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

291	2017-02-18	Lisa LaDore	<p>Dear EAO, Please reconsider building the plant. It would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbor porpoise, a species of special concern. Not to mention the pollution it would cause for the surrounding human population. Please keep this area safe for all the creatures and future generations! Thank you, Lisa LaDore Sincerely, Lisa LaDore, Harrison cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
292	2017-02-18	Lou Baird	<p>Dear EAO, Salmon are more vital to BC and the health of the ocean and fresh waterways than any gas plant, forestry operation, or any other so-called "economic engine/job creation" project(s) can ever be. It's time the government actually put the environment first over any other factor. Once we ruin the environment, we are just being self-destructive to ourselves. And you know I'm right, no study group or committee formation required. It's just common sense. Do the right thing and stop this and other projects that will harm so much of the environment. Other countries are currently so envious of what we have, why are we so willing to give it all away? For a dollar? There are things more precious than jobs and money, salmon is just one of the many treasures BC has let's NOT put them in harms way with "progress". Sincerely, Lou Baird, Campbell River cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
293	2017-02-18	david f boehm,B.Sc.,	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, david f boehm,B.Sc., gabriola island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
294	2017-02-18	Alicia Hecht	<p>Dear EAO, Are oil spills ok to damage the environment, from Alaska oil spill, BP etc.... Is it ok to use a sink as a lighter???? Is it ok to give cancer to people and animals, for the sake of fracking???? Anyone with a sense of common sense and human kindness, and knows to put people before profit, is smart enough to know the answer is NO. Now the oil companies want to destroy the salmon. REALLY!!!! Enough is enough. The answer is NO NO NO!!! Enough said!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Sincerely, Alicia Hecht, Fullerton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
295	2017-02-18	Doreen Dewell	<p>Dear EAO, Haven't you heard that Canada's Arctic is warming at an alarming rate and that melting snow, ice, etc. is accelerating the rate of sea level rise? Get with it and invest in renewable energy sources, for Pete's sake! I am very horrified by the continued use of fossil fuels, even so called "clean burning" natural gas. Sincerely, Doreen Dewell, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>
296	2017-02-18	Brad Lucas	<p>Dear EAO, With the declining numbers of wild fish, I think this is the wrong place and wrong time for this project. Please do the right thing and think about the future of our oceans and make sure there's any fish left for our kids. Sincerely, Brad Lucas, North van cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
297	2017-02-18	Lisa Hammermeister	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Lisa Hammermeister, Granada Hills cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
298	2017-02-18	Nan Kendy	<p>Dear EAO, I am writing to express my dismay at the massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen for Digby Island! As a resident of northern BC I deeply treasure the critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon found in these waters not to mention Digby Islands ancient muskeg wetlands home to many species of birds who will be impacted by gas flaring. In short, it is time to start preserving our wild spaces and wild food sources for the next generations. We need to start now! Sincerely, Nan Kendy, Prince George BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

299	2017-02-18	Nick Robson	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Nick Robson, Aldergrove cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
300	2017-02-18	Henner Grimm	Dear EAO,I am a 92 year old veteran and live atthe sho So why do we have to build one at the mouth of the Skeena Riverre of Stuart Lake. The decline of samon in the the last 25 years has been devastating.I do not see anymore salmon going up the rivers and small creeks for spawning.Is there not a plant under cnstruction near kitimat alresy ? Sincerely, Henner Grimm, Fort St. James cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
301	2017-02-18	John Callas	Dear EAO, I object to projects like the Aurora LNG that threaten our environment or our wildlife, including fish. This project needs to be moved or cancelled to protect the local habitat. Sincerely, John Callas, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
302	2017-02-18	G Loewen	Dear EAO, It is your duty to protect our waters (oceans, ground water, rivers, lakes, streams, etc) so that we have a healthy, clean environment for all living species including plants, sea animals, humans, and birds. With the evidence that fracking increase the chance of earthquakes, it is vital that a fracking plant not be built in a location that affects the estuary that supports salmon fry, a staple food for bears, humans, eagles, etc. Fracking does not lead BC towards our environmental committment signed by Trudeau in Europe. Sincerely, G Loewen, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
303	2017-02-18	Maryann Emery	Dear EAO, I strongly, strongly request that you do not grant permission for Aurora LNG to be built. Our wild salmon are our natural heritage and projects like these hasten their demise and contribute to climate change. This is completely unacceptable and must be stopped. I remember the first time I saw wild salmon. This was such a miracle! Now, for quick profits, we seem ready to destroy them forever. Please protect our salmon and wildlife and stop this project. The northern economy should be sustainable. Protect our Skeena wild salmon. Sincerely, Maryann Emery, Golden, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
304	2017-02-18	cecilia olea	Dear EAO, Sincerely, cecilia olea, lima cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
305	2017-02-18	Janet Vesterback	Dear EAO, The money and jobs generated by this project are not worth the trade off of threats to our safety and health and the destruction of wildlife and habitat. It's time to come up with creative solutions to providing energy and jobs that don't endanger the environment and the many species, including humankind, that rely upon it for survival. Please think again. Invest in a better future for us all. Sincerely, Janet Vesterback, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
306	2017-02-18	Brian Turner	Dear EAO, Re:Aurora LNG project How could we even be considering this? Sincerely, Brian Turner, North Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
307	2017-02-18	Judy Fairless	Dear EAO, Please stop the fracking. It damages the environment, wildlife, fish, water and people. Salmon are most at risk at this point, but the whole environment is at stake. Please protect the environment and LIFE. Sincerely, Judy Fairless, Warren cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
308	2017-02-18	Linda Ford-Bedard	Dear EAO, The proposed Aurora LNG gas plant would be a disaster for BC. It would damage salmon habitat, and also cause harm to migrating birds and other wildlife. Blasting and drillingwould affect the local communities, causing noise, light and air pollution. The First Nations peoples have not given approval and this is their land! Do not support this plant. Sincerely, Linda Ford-Bedard, Parksville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

309	2017-02-18	Ginamarie Felker	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ginamarie Felker, Millstone cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
310	2017-02-18	Robyn Long	Dear EAO, These plans are going add to the destruction of our beautiful state. By the sounds of the plans the license plates will probably have to change. Why? I have have been in Beautiful British Columbia my intire life. What this company is doing is adding to a whole world of problems. Myself and many others would really like to keep the name and reputation of BC. This means the salmon and wild life are able to survive, or are we just going to end up like everywhere else in this world too concerned with money. Please look at the migrations being destroyed and the people who will suffer. Have a heart it's already getting harder to get clean water. Yours truly Robyn Sincerely, Robyn Long, Prince George cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
311	2017-02-18	Robert Lilly	Dear EAO, Please reject the Aurora LNG.I'm concerned about the long term degradation of our natural areas, our wildlife, and especially the salmon in this area. -Robert Lilly Sincerely, Robert Lilly, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
312	2017-02-18	Peggy Fugate	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Peggy Fugate, Oxford cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
313	2017-02-18	Kenneth Lapointe	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kenneth Lapointe, Ottawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
314	2017-02-18	Alex Degen	Dear EAO, we all have either children, or grand children to think of. We need to make sure the future we give them is best we have to offer , we do this with their welfare , their education, why not their environment as well. We grew up enjoying it why cant they as well. think of the future legacy , think of it now! Sincerely, Alex Degen, Strathmore cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
315	2017-02-18	Viola Ganz	Dear EAO, Anything that is now proposed that is a threat to our wildlife habitat zones should be cancelled.. Think of our fish, birds...and most important of all,.... think of our PEOPLE...lives count. And besides...it is not even a Canadian company!! Sincerely, Viola Ganz, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
316	2017-02-18	Bryce Kendrick	The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. Sincerely, Bryce Kendrick, North Saanich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
317	2017-02-18	Petra Jones	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Petra Jones, Sydney cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

318	2017-02-18	Ian and Brenda May	Dear EAO, Please protect the Skeena salmon. We seem to have a clear choice here. We either continue to play into the hands of those who would ruthlessly destroy critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon or protect these struggling wild fish. It is apparent to all those who care that you cannot have it both ways. Sincerely, ian and Brenda May, North Saanich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
319	2017-02-18	Ryan Lift	Dear EAO, I a reaching out to you as a student in BC and as an advocate for our coast in hope you will reconsider your decisions regarding the future of our province. I have grown up on our coastal rainforest here in BC, everything about this coast is amazing especially the biodiversity such as our local BC wild salmon. Living on the coast I have seen and experienced many changes that humans have caused especially this last fishing season... we did not see or catch a single salmon in a once bountiful location. Please don't further exploit our coast nor deplete our local salmon species which make this coast unique. Do right by the citizens of BC and protect our unique and precious coast. Thank you Sincerely, Ryan Lift, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
320	2017-02-18	CARLOS PILQUIL	Dear EAO, Sincerely, CARLOS PILQUIL, SANTIAGO cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
321	2017-02-18	Bill Hadgkiss	Dear EAO, BC's salmon populations are already hurting (fish farms). We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating International Siting Standards. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain FREE, PRIOR and INFORMED Consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. It is the same now as it was hundreds of years ago. The abuse of locals is still done by foreign governments (China). But, now it is done and condoned by our own (really?) governments who are controlled by corporations (follow the money) and Future Considerations by/of/for our politicians and government bureaucrats, (1st eg. the current Brian Mulroney). Fed up I am. Sincerely, Bill Hadgkiss, Kamloops cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
322	2017-02-18	Fred Richer	Dear EAO, This no place for an LNG terminal! Sincerely, Fred Richer, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
323	2017-02-18	Maureen Lyons	Dear EAO, Please don't allow the construction of an LNG plant on Digby Island. Or anywhere near the Skeena or the Prince Rupert harbour. The north is not just some big expanse of space to be exploited for capital gain! It is a vital piece of the huge interconnected web that is our planet. I was born and raised there, I know how important the salmon are and how dangerous the harbour mouth is and how fragile the ecosystem is. I also totally honour the will of the local indigenous people. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. If I have to come there to defend my homeland, I will. But I am 70 years old and I just want to leave the planet and especially the north coast as a legacy for all the generations to come. I want to come back to the north to celebrate its incredible beauty and diversity, not to be in a battle to preserve it! Sincerely, Maureen Lyons, Winlaw cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
324	2017-02-18	Bernadette Keenan	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG Plant threatens Salmon and wildlife habitat including important wetlands. The plant threatens community health and safety by polluting drinking water, soil and air. Noise pollution will occur too. Also LNG development promotes fossil fuel dependency which results in climate change. Plus I have seen information that suggests LNG is not even very economically sound right now as there is a glut on the world market. Stop the Aurora LNG plant. Sincerely, Bernadette Keenan, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

325	2017-02-18	John Jeglum	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The proposed location of the Aurora LNG is very close to the mouth of the Skeena River. Salmon are a mainstay of the First Nations along the Skeena and the proposed location would have negative effects on the young salmon which pass through this area. The proposed positioning of the LNG gas plant is less than a kilometer from the historic village of Dodge Cove. The assess the LNG site by vessels is through a narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe storms. In my judgement, the mouth of the Skeena should be reserved for the salmon migrations and the great multitude of other fish and aquatic birds and mammals. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project.</p> <p>This plant will release 6.7 million tonnes per year. To that must be added the large emissions of both upstream production and pipelines, and the downstream releases during transportation and final burning. I urge you to not pass the project.</p> <p>Sincerely, John Jeglum, Duncan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
326	2017-02-18	Nancy Price-Munn	<p>Dear EAO I love this province and on behalf of its fishing industry, it's native peoples and those who speak for the land and waters of BC, I ask you to stop Aurora LNG. DON't give our patrimony away to those who seek only profit. Your defense of the Skeena and it's wildlife will speak to your chances of reelection by those who care</p> <p>Sincerely N. Price-Munn Physician Sincerely, Nancy Price-Munn, Nanoose bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
327	2017-02-18	Janet Hudgins	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Janet Hudgins, Vancouver, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
328	2017-02-18	Dee Paquette	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Dee Paquette, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
329	2017-02-18	Catherine Guertin	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Stop this carbon bomb! For the future of our childrens and the nature.</p> <p>Thanks you Catherine Guertin Sincerely, Catherine Guertin, Saint-Sauveur cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
330	2017-02-18	Karla Devine	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Karla Devine, MANHATTAN BEACH cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

331	2017-02-18	Judith Price	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to ask you to not go ahead with the Aurora LNG plant. There are so many reasons to halt this project, including community health and safety concerns and long term climate impact concerns, but the most urgent concern is the plant's threat to salmon and wildlife.</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.</p> <p>The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>We cannot justify in any way calling ourselves environmental stewards while moving ahead with this monster project.</p> <p>What are you thinking??</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Price, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p>
332	2017-02-18	Jenefer Smalley	<p>Dear EAO, DO NOT BUILD THIS LNG plant, you do not have permissions from BC. This is a vested interest project that has many possible irreversible negative impacts to one of the worlds last wild salmon strong holds. This venture disgusts me. It shows how negligent our government is when it comes to the environment!! There is no balance in any of it, and CA needs to become a climate leader for future generations. We are going backwards with projects like this, our salmon and Orca Whales are suffering, and we are not doing enough. Without salmon BC's coast losses it soull!</p> <p>This project is NOT PERMITTED.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jenefer Smalley, Gibsons</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
333	2017-02-18	Carolyn Laporte	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Carolyn Laporte, Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
334	2017-02-18	Emily Millard	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I disagree with the Aurora LNG project. I believe the future of British Columbia is in eco-tourism and renewable energy resources and not the exploitation of natural resources at the risk of environmental disaster and deterioration.</p> <p>I expect you to listen to your citizens and put the health of land and ocean ahead of short-term economic gain.</p> <p>Yours truly, Emily Millard</p> <p>Sincerely, Emily Millard, Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
335	2017-02-18	Richard Baker	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Richard Baker, La Mesa</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
336	2017-02-18	Mary Andrews	<p>Dear EAO,Why does your government keep crucifying Nature, especially when it benefits only your deep pocketed supporters???</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Andrews, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
337	2017-02-18	james hermon	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The Aurora LNG must be stopped. Whatever economic benefits this oil project might provide will not justify its environmental costs. Fracking is a particularly destructive practice whose well known and documented effects include earthquakes and pollution of air and water. To further endanger our shrinking salmon stocks would be the height of irresponsibility and stupidity! Any forward-thinking and civilized country would ban this practice based on the horrible effects we have observed from its practice. We don't need more big oil projects anyway! Renewable energy sources are the future. Let's invest in a future that doesn't stink.</p> <p>Sincerely, james hermon, SECHELT</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
338	2017-02-18	Monica Huibers	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>We must protect our remaining (and dwindling) healthy fish and healthy ecosystems. Clean water and food will be a growing issue for all of us and future generations. Please stand up for what's right and best for the long term interests of ALL! Thank you!</p> <p>Sincerely, Monica Huibers, Kimberley, BC</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
339	2017-02-18	Trudi Nye	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please consider discontinuing plans for Aurora fracked gas plant. Delusion Bay provides critical salmon habitat, which this project will threaten. Surely we have reached the stage where we can see the absolute requirement that those can, must protect what is most important to the survival of this planet and all its remaining life.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Trudi Nye, South Lake Tahoe</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>



340	2017-02-18	Sivalla Lin	Dear EAO, Please do not allow LNG on Digbey Island. LNG is not clean, sustainable energy and it would destroy salmon and other wildlife habitat. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. It is time to turn to clean sustainable energy like solar, wind and wave technology. Anything else is suicidal for the human race and all life on the planet. Wake up and act with integrity! Thank you! Sincerely, Sivalla Lin, Saltspring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
341	2017-02-18	Pam Benson	Dear EAO, As a tax paying citizen of B.C. I want to say that I am not in favor of the Aurora LNG.....From my research on the issue I do not believe that the financial benefits of this project outweigh the health and safety risks to the surrounding community., the risks to our already greatly stressed salmon environment, plus it is a step away from reduction of fossil fuel usage at a critical point in addressing the impact of climate change. I am greatly disappointed in our government making decisions in favor of immediate financial benefit at the expense of disregarding the long term effects and costs. It is time to draw the line for fossil fuels and begin to build towards a cleaner environmentally friendly energy use. The science and technology are there! Other governments and countries are and have done it. Why can't we.?! Thank you for your attention to this matter Sincerely, Pam Benson, Westbank cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
342	2017-02-18	Yarrow Koontz	Dear EAO, Salmon create the 'backbone' for British Columbia's unique ecosystems; rivers, forests and provide food for a diverse number of animals including humans. Our rivers are already too toxic for spawning salmon, putting our province at risk of losing these incredible animals that migrate from the ocean, up the rivers from where they were hatched. Their bodies in turn, feed the rivers and the animals that rely on them - salmon DNA is found in trees miles from the rivers. This is how much these fish feed our province in so many ways. Please, do not let this gas plant destroy one last vestige of spawning grounds for the salmon. Thank you. Yarrow Koontz Sincerely, Yarrow Koontz, Gabriola Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. With respect to potential effects to salmon, the results of our assessment indicate the predicted loss of marine riparian vegetation would be below regulatory thresholds included in the Fisheries Act, and is unlikely to affect the long-term persistence of any marine fish population. As well, a Fish Habitat Offsetting plan and a wetlands offsetting plan will be created in collaboration with government, Aboriginal Groups and local communities to offset any potential serious harm to fish habitat or important wetland areas as a result of our proposed project. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects
343	2017-02-18	Lillian Varcoe	Dear EAO, When the salmon is gone, we'll rue the day when we allowed such damaging enterprises to continue. Don't think it will happen?...look at the demise of the east-coast cod. Sincerely, Lillian Varcoe, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
344	2017-02-18	Stephen Parslow	Dear EAO, The world LNG market does not justify BC's push for LNG development. The risk to our salmon populations with this fracking project is too great! Please do not allow this to proceed. Thanks in advance, Stephen Parslow Sincerely, Stephen Parslow, North Saanich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
345	2017-02-18	Ryan Carter't	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ryan Carter't, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

346	2017-02-18	Katherine Maas	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The proposed Aurora LGN fracked gas plant imposes an unacceptable level of risk to the Skeena salmon run. Up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year in this area, which provides critical habitat for coho, steelhead, and sockeye.</p> <p>Additionally, this plant will threaten other wildlife, as it provides important habitat for migrating birds like ducks, geese, sandhill cranes, blue herons, swans, and song birds. Land wildlife could be impacted by the terminal's gas flaring, which would send burning gases into the air around this habitat. Tanker noise will impact marine mammals and construction will destroy bird nesting areas and block migration routes.</p> <p>It will also pollute the air, water, and soil of local communities. Construction noise will create significant impact to local residents.</p> <p>Construction of this plant in a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms raises the potential for collisions, groundings, and oil spills. Three First Nations' traditional territories are located at this site; it will impact their ability to rely on the area for food harvesting and fishing.</p> <p>Finally, this plant would threaten our climate by producing 6.7 million tons of GHG a year, smashing through BC's climate targets and blowing our carbon budget.</p> <p>Please, please, don't do this!</p> <p>Sincerely, Katherine Maas, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
347	2017-02-18	Maryjka Mychajlowycz	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>As a coastal BC resident, I am completely opposed to the Aurora LNG plant proposed for Digby Island just north of the Skeena River estuary. It would cause detrimental impacts to salmon and other wildlife, to local ecosystems and to local human communities, and create spill risks. It would be a "carbon bomb" that would blow BC's greenhouse gas emission targets.</p> <p>All environmental indicators point against this project. Please do not approve it.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maryjka Mychajlowycz, Tofino</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
348	2017-02-18	Kyle Barber	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Kyle Barber, Langley</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
349	2017-02-18	Sara Paoluzzi	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Sara Paoluzzi, Saçile</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
350	2017-02-18	Gord Kukec	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Gord Kukec, Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
351	2017-02-18	Ann Andrews	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This fracked gas plant proposed by Nexon will be a danger to the Skeena Salmon - this area is essential habitat and its contamination will be a disaster. Salmon are essential to the economy of the area and must be protected. There is also the matter of the environment - every living thing is connected and the loss or contamination of one leads to the danger of others being adversely affected.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ann Andrews, Black Creek B.C</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

352	2017-02-18	M Jansen	<p>Dear Environmental Assessment Office,</p> <p>We are very much opposed to the fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen. The proposed plant is to be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. This spells disaster for these salmon and for other species such as migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! First Nations are opposed to this project and, as a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. This has not been accomplished.</p> <p>BC must abide by its treaty rights and its obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Please ensure this plant is not allowed to proceed.</p> <p>Sincerely, M Jansen, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
353	2017-02-18	Rainey Hopewell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Regarding the Aurora LNG plant, I'm left nearly speechless by the immeasurable recklessness of this proposal, &amp; your continued pursuit of it. The original meaning of "idiot" (from the Greek) was descriptive of "a person who refuses to participate in public life." Hello! Wake up! What part of "no" don't you understand? According to the Greek definition of idiot, your on-going refusal to listen to British Columbians about this ill-advised LNG plant qualifies. Continuing to pursue this project is a shocking refusal to participate with British Columbians to figure out how to do power in ways that don't trash other earthlings. Come on! Come join us! We need you; we want you; we would welcome you on the home-team. "Home" in this case, being Earth. "Team" in this case being all earthlings. You're part of us. We all depend upon the same life-support system. And as any astronaut will tell you: we have to maintain the life-support system as if our lives depend upon it, because they do. That's true for salmon. And it's true for everything else as well. I would love to sing your names in praise, for stopping this project. Please. Please stop it. I'm willing to beg, on behalf of all of us, &amp; I do so, now. I beg you: please stop it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rainey Hopewell, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
354	2017-02-18	Robert Tritschler	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It is time that we start to think longer than one term of office. I know LNG is the buzz word of the present government and unless we start to take some very hard looks at what we are doing around estuaries and fresh water salmon bearing streams and rivers, they will be lost forever. We do not live in Peru and Ecuador where bribes can buy you anything. LNG and all hydrocarbon fuels will not be used in fifty years and yet we still have the beaver pelt mentality and will rape and plunder to get good numbers in the next quarter... be it corporate or governmental</p> <p>This shameful and hard to believe in 2017 we are still only thinking of the near future..</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Tritschler, Parksville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
355	2017-02-18	john fry	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Once ruined, always ruined. That's the bottom line. You know this. BC doesn't need this project. The world does not need this project. Put your money toward a better plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, John Fry, Bowen Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
356	2017-02-18	manuela wolter	<p>Dear EAO,!!</p> <p>The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone.!!</p> <p>Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. !!</p> <p>First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.!!</p> <p>Sincerely, manuela wolter, san-jose cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
357	2017-02-18	Nancy Issenman	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG is not a good plan.</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. The wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project because it would also affect their health.</p> <p>Please do all you can to stop it.</p> <p>Thank you Sincerely, Nancy Issenman, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

358	2017-02-18	Ginette Huart	Dear EAO, BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. I say "NO" to fracked gas plant. Thank you! Sincerely, Ginette Huart, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
359	2017-02-18	jean pyka	Dear EAO, Sincerely, jean pyka, Salmon Arm, cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
360	2017-02-18	philip grange	Dear EAO, the fossil fuel thing is short term only, the wild salmon , and other wild creatures must be with us for ever. please do not permit any infrastructure which could harm the long term habitat of wild creatures on our coast. Sincerely, philip grange, salt spring island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
361	2017-02-18	Marci Wilson	Dear EAO, No no no to the Aurora LNG! The salmon and wildlife depend on you to make the right decision. Please do NOT let them and us down!! Sincerely, Marcie Wilson, Mission cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
362	2017-02-18	Julie Barnett	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Julie Barnett, Duluth cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
363	2017-02-18	Sasha Kubicek	Dear EAO, Fracking is an environmental disaster and our province should be investing in renewable energy sources. I urge you to not put short term profits ahead of our environment and our global climate. There is no place for this type of industry on BC's Coast. Thank you., Sasha Kubicek BC Resident Sincerely, Sasha Kubicek, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
364	2017-02-18	Jan Zwicky	Dear EAO, I am very concerned about the Aurora LNG facility that Nexen is proposing to build near Prince Rupert. The plant would be situated on the Skeena estuary, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon. As we have seen recently at Bella Bella, these coastal waters are simply not safe for oil and gas projects. Assurances from companies that they have 'clean-up plans' are worth nothing. The spills must be prevented in the first place, and the only way to do that is not to build the plants. As a species, humans must transition off fossil fuels NOW. In addition to posing a threat to salmon, Aurora would add 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere every year. This is absolutely unacceptable, given the terrifying need to keep global temperature increase below 2'. I urge you in the strongest terms not to approve this project. Thank you for your attention to my concerns. Sincerely, Jan Zwicky, Heriot Bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
365	2017-02-18	Terry Lawrence	Dear EAO, Our salmon and environment are under attack from all sides, and the last thing we need is an LNG plant that uses huge amounts of electricity to compress the gas obtained from fracking, which itself is destructive to the environment and a major contributor to greenhouse gasses, especially methane, as well as contaminating groundwater. I would urge you to reject this proposal. Sincerely, Terry Lawrence, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
366	2017-02-18	Lynda Augustus	Dear EAO, BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. We need to stop destroying the wildlife of B.C. in order to sell our natural resources to Asia. The B.C. government has never been given a mandate to ravage our lands and destroy the traditional lives of people. Sincerely, Lynda Augustus, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

367	2017-02-18	Bassam Imam	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Bassam Imam, Montreal cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
368	2017-02-18	Louise Goueffic	Dear EAO, If we cannot protect the Skeena salmon, how much do we really care about planet earth? Fracking is a destructive method of doing things on the planet. It's not just the salmon that are threatened, it's also life lived to it's fullest possibilities.. Fracking is another destructive method added to so many other destructive acts being done by those who are greedy and power hungry. It's time we stop "falling on our knees" in worship to those who don't give a damn about anyone or anything else. . Sincerely, Louise Goueffic, Port Hope cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
369	2017-02-18	Marleen Paulus	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marleen Paulus, Hoegaarden cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
370	2017-02-18	Ronald Wright	Dear EAO, I respectfully urge you to deny the Aurora-Nexen application. This gas plant will be an immediate threat to the Skeena ecology. It also threatens the long-term health of BC's air, earth, and water. The most recent studies show that LNG extraction does indeed release toxins into the water table, as many people have long feared. It has also been shown to trigger earthquakes in many parts of the world. LNG does NOT offer BC a way to prosperity. Instead, it will poison our water and land for generations. It's just not worth the risk. Ronald Wright Sincerely, Ronald Wright, Salt Spring cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
371	2017-02-18	Michel Fournier	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Michel Fournier, Montreal cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
372	2017-02-18	Kathleen Eaton	Dear EAO, The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Kathleen Eaton, Middletown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
373	2017-02-18	D Brent	Dear EAO, It is time to stop the insanity of exposing our environment to the harm of LNG production in this province, country and world. We are not doing our grandkids and great grandkids any favours by allowing this to continue. Cease these harmful polluting, health dangers, in these industries now. Sincerely, D Brent, Burnaby, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

374	2017-02-18	Nancy Wilson	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. I am against it. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> Please care about the same Skeena salmon that are threatened by the Petronas fracked gas plant, another critical moment has come to stand up for them. Nexen is proposing to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas. BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Add to this: As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Nancy Wilson, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
375	2017-02-18	R PALM	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. <b>DO NOT ALLOW IT!</b> Sincerely, R PALM, DRIPPING SPRINGS cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
376	2017-02-18	Kalinke ten Hulzen	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kalinke ten Hulzen, Ede, Netherlands cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
377	2017-02-18	Rob Seltzer	<p>Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Rob Seltzer, Malibu cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
378	2017-02-18	William Huggins	<p>Dear EAO, As someone who has been lucky enough to travel to BC and enjoy its lush wildness, some of the last intact ecosystems of their kind in the world, I urge you to protect Skeena wild salmon and not allow Aurora LNG to go forward with their project. Salmon are a keystone species not only in the ecological sense but also to the local economy where they are essential. When I return to BC I would like to see it as pristine as it was when I first encountered it. Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns. Sincerely, William Huggins, Las Vegas cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

379	2017-02-18	Barbara Hansen	<p>Dear EAO,  Who is sitting in the circle with the salmon, the birds, the water...  Who is listening with open hearts?  Who is listening to the hearts and voices of those yet unborn?  Who is listening to those of us who believe this is damaging to the future of our planet and all our relations?  I am opposed to fracking. I am opposed to LNG. I support the development of alternative means of supplying energy that are compatible with the environment.  I am opposed to this government's short-term, intimate relationship with foreign owned corporations who benefit economically from raping the natural resources given to us to steward - to care for and respect.  Sincerely,  Barbara Hansen, Victoria  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
380	2017-02-18	Rosemary Graham-Gardner	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Rosemary Graham-Gardner, Manhattan Beach  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
381	2017-02-18	Amanda Jacobs	<p>Dear EAO, What does a Chinese oil giant care about our beautiful province. Nothing. Our entire coast is dependent on the salmon. Bear, wolf, eagle, even the trees are full of salmon. First nations fisheries and tourism. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  Sincerely,  Amanda Jacobs, Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
382	2017-02-18	Iori borthwick	<p>Dear EAO,  Salmon is a multi million dollar industry as well as being a cornerstone for many coastal native communities.  They and all of nature deserve our protection, our best efforts to protect them.  Our continued ravaging of the earth for Oil, and Gas will cause us all to pay as we head into what will likely be the hottest year on record. There will be extreme heat, droughts, wildfires,..... eventually we will not survive.  Stop now. Protect the Earth.  Sincerely,  Iori borthwick, belleville  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
383	2017-02-18	Deborah Boulton	<p>Dear EAO,  This is the wrong place for this development, near the skeena river.  Please do not do it.  Deborah  Sincerely,  Deborah Boulton, Victoria  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
384	2017-02-18	Dawn O'DONNELL	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Dawn O'DONNELL, Greenfield  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
385	2017-02-18	Corissa McNeilly	<p>Dear EAO,  Digby Island is not a place for an LNG plant. The historic community of Dodge Cove would be directly impacted by the noise and chemical pollution from this plant which is proposed too close to the community, according to the international siting standards. This area provides important wetland and shoreline habitat to salmon, coastal wolves, harbour porpoise, bald eagles, sandhill cranes and many more iconic coastal species. Furthermore, the project must obtain the permission from three original nations, whose traditional use of the territories overlap here, to comply with the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.  Sincerely,  Corissa McNeilly, Bella Coola  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

386	2017-02-18	Eileen Wttewaall	<p>Dear members of the Environmental Assessment Office:</p> <p>As a BC coastal resident for 35 years, I know the fragility of the phenomenal wealth of the abundant flora and fauna of the whole coast. No one has the right, especially for the bottom line of a corporation, to jeopardize the health of all life by increasing more tons of greenhouse gas emissions when we know the crucial and urgent need to reduce those emissions.</p> <p>Yours on behalf of life, not money.</p> <p>Sincerely, Eileen Wttewaall, Salt Spring island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
387	2017-02-18	susan nelson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please don't mess up our coast. We love it just the way it is. We are doing enough to try and destroy it ourselves, we don't need your help.</p> <p>Sincerely, susan nelson, Parksville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
388	2017-02-18	A. O.Schaller	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, A. O.Schaller, DE cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
389	2017-02-18	Sheila Desmond	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I was fortunate enough to live in Prince Rupert for over a year and found it to be one of the most beautiful, pristine places I've ever lived. Numerous fishermen live and work out of Prince Rupert. They are hard workers who love what they do. Fracking is known to cause pollution and earthquakes, among other hazards; however, the main disaster here would be killing thousands of fish and other ocean animals.</p> <p>Please say no to Aurora LNG. This company does not have the best interests of Canadians at heart, nor do they care about the fish or fishermen in or around Prince Rupert.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sincerely, Sheila Desmond, Cameron Park cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
390	2017-02-18	Kathie Road	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Why, Why are we doing this again? Surely the environmental research which stopped Petronas also applies here. Maybe even more so. Do you not care about BC's Fishermen? BC's wildlife? BC's Salmon? BC's Coastal waters? Why do i even have to write this letter?? This time you actions endanger, besides salmon, all sorts of migrating birds, song birds, and sea creatures especially whales and porpoises. Natural Gas isn't even viable and everybody knows it. Please stop catering to foreign, often questionable corporations, and start thinking about how we can provide real jobs that promote and celebrate our special, exceptional environment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathie Road, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
391	2017-02-18	Martha Herrero	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Martha Herrero, Costa Mesa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
392	2017-02-18	Steve Loxley	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to you concerning the massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen.</p> <p>It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Please stop this carbon bomb! many thanks for your attention, Sincerely, Steve Loxley, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>



393	2017-02-18	Tara Verbridge	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Tara Verbridge, Windsor cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
394	2017-02-18	Stuart Evans	Dear EAO, There seems to be no bounds to the extent the fossil fuel industry will go to, to make a dollar. Siting this proposed development in such close proximity to a salmon and wildlife habitat zone is a disaster in the making. There's a reason wildlife zone-in on peaceful and remote locations - it's because that's where they are MOST comfortable. You can't move this wildlife to somewhere more convenient to the developers. I'm not a supporter of fracking generally, but this proposed development adds an particularly nasty aspect to GHG producing industry that is natural gas extraction. Please stop this development before it is allowed to cause permanent damage the local environment. Sincerely, Stuart Evans, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
395	2017-02-18	Marty Landa	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marty Landa, Sedona cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
396	2017-02-18	Morna Halparin	Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. <b>NO TO AURORA LNG</b> Sincerely, Morna Halparin, Winnipeg cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
397	2017-02-18	Eve Saglietto	Dear EAO, no fracking in Price Rupert and Digby Island, it is the land of First Nations and wildlife, not to sale and not to destroy Sincerely, Eve Saglietto, Seeshaupt cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
398	2017-02-18	Owen Whiting	Dear EA Please keep all fracking and refinery actions away from fish bearing waterways. On behalf of my children and theirs. Sincerely, Owen Whiting, Sooke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
399	2017-02-18	Gabriele Chaykowski	Dear EAO, The planned Aurora LNG plant is threatening so much compared to the questionable profits it will bring to BC. Time is running out to preserve our wild salmon stocks and the impacts are gravely. Our resident orca populations are dwindling. Emaciated dead members of the pods are turning up more often than ever - the news are devastating. They depend on the wild salmon runs for survival and they don't find enough of them to survive. This impacts a lively and economically important whale watch tourism industry as well. No salmon no whales, no tourist dollars. In the event of a spill the impacts on water and flora and fauna would be catastrophic! Please don't sell out our pristine coastline and waters to cheap corporate interests. When the last salmon is gone we will find that we can't feed money to our children! We need to take immediate steps to save wild salmon and clean water. Please don't approve Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Gabriele Chaykowski, Courtenay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

400	2017-02-18	Jo Phillips	Dear EAO, Please do not consider destroying valuable fish habitat in order to pursue any further LNG plants or terminals. The days of LNG and fossil fuels in general are quite obviously over. The days of our ecosystem are never over. Thanks Sincerely, Jo Phillips, Sooke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
401	2017-02-18	j Paddon	Dear EAO, Do not allow any more fracking. If you don't stop fracking, you are allowing the destruction of our wildlife and planet. Sincerely, j Paddon, NORTH VANCOUVER cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
402	2017-02-18	anouk lavigne	Dear EAO, It feels like, just under Harper, under Turdeau and Clark, Canada is still for sale for foreign interests. This is OUR land and ressources and the Natives': protect what is ours commonly and stop filling your pockets with foreign dollars that impoverish us all here. Protect the Skeena salmon from China and others, protect the community of Dodge Cove: respect our land, respect our wildlife, respect the poeple and country who have you has its leaders. Sincerely, anouk lavigne, vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
403	2017-02-18	Evelyne Boehni	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Evelyne Boehni, Italia cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
404	2017-02-18	David Pickett	Dear EAO, Sincerely, David Pickett, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
405	2017-02-18	Jennifer Little	Dear EAO, Moving forward on this results in: * gas flaring resulting in burning gasses into the air; * Construction of the plant + the proposed 3-lane roadway resulting in the destruction of wildlife and human habitat not to mention the associated noise and pollution; * Tanker noise - further impacting land and air creatures; * and finally - fracking - with its concomitant greenhouse gas emissions . And this does not even begin to address the First Nation issues and their rights. Please do not approve this project. Thank you for listening. Sincerely, Jennifer Little, Richmond cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
406	2017-02-18	Richard Szerepi	Dear EAO, I think it is time to stip this type of mining that risks our salmon and wildlife habitat. Do not let this plant to start up and destroy our environment. Sincerely, Richard Szerepi, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
407	2017-02-18	Dr. Latham Hunter	Dear EAO, I am a Canadian citizen and I am emphatically against allowing Aurora LNG to be built on Digby Island. It would be a betrayal of the community, the wildlife, and most of all, to our children, whose future is increasingly fragile thanks to short-term greed and dinosaur industries. Digby island is a crucial wildlife habitat, and the Aurora plant would contribute well over 6 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year. It would be absolute madness to go through with this deal, especially when there are so many more up-to-date, exciting opportunities to pursue in renewables. Please do not make more of the same mistakes so many leaders keep making -- please show some wisdom and leadership in saying "no" to more oil and gas development. Sincerely, Dr. Latham Hunter, Freelton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
408	2017-02-18	Robert Lombardi	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Robert Lombardi, Brooklyn cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
409	2017-02-18	Marjorie Garside	Dear EAO, Please consider the irreversible damage the Aurora LNG project poses to a valued salmon habitat, and the wildlife of this area.. LNG threatens the planet's climate - we can't afford to approve this project. Sincerely, Marjorie Garside, North Saanich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

410	2017-02-18	Sheila O'Byrne	Dear EAO, Please stop the fracked gas plant... proposed by Nexen, which is owned by CNOOC.... save our fish and the environment... sincerely, sheila o'byrne Sincerely, Sheila O'Byrne, victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
411	2017-02-18	Luca Malaguti	Dear EAO, Please consider carefully the adverse effects generated by LNG products and by-products on aquatic species. Some of these effects are irreversible and the damage they could cause can extend in many areas of an already sensitive ecosystem. Please assess the situation carefully and look at all the possible biological receptors and species most at risk in this vast area. Sincerely, A concerned liberal, citizen and engineer. Luca M. Sincerely, Luca Malaguti, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
412	2017-02-18	Darlene Jakusz	Dear EAO, Please say NO to Aurora Lng! Why would you allow a Chinese oil giant to come into our Country and build a massive fracked gas plant to put at risk the nearby community of Dodge Cove. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora Lng could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas! DO NOT ALLOW THIS FOREIGN CO. TO DESTROY OUR ENVIRONMENT!!!!!!! Sincerely, Darlene Jakusz, Amherst Jct. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
413	2017-02-18	Betty Massson	Dear EAO, Enough of this talk of LNG. Save our beautiful environment first. Our salmon are one of the most important resources in our province, and a pristine, scenic country is not the place to be installing LNG plants. Do the right thing, back off this ridiculous idea. Save the Salmon. Sincerely, Betty Massson, Gibsons cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
414	2017-02-18	Michael Erdmann	Dear EAO, I'm writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed Aurora LNG gas plant. To put it simply, the potential economic benefit of such a plant pales in comparison to the economic/environmental risks: - to the Skeena salmon population - local wildlife (especially those reliant on Digby Island's muskeg wetlands - the health and safety of surrounding communities In addition, such a project should NEVER go forward without the permission of the Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala people which it does not have. Any legitimate environmental assessment must also consider the projects contribution to global climate change. Even without this project, BC is far from realizing our own meagre goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Given this situation and the urgency of tackling this problem, building new infrastructure that will increase these emissions is completely unacceptable. Sincerely, Michael Erdmann, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
415	2017-02-18	Marie-Ange Berchem	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marie-Ange Berchem, Altlinster cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
416	2017-02-18	Marc Serpa	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marc Serpa, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

417	2017-02-18	Art Johnson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>As a concerned BC citizen, I am opposed to the proposed Aurora LNG plant at Delusion Bay. This plant would present danger to the steelhead, sockeye, and coho salmon habitat of the area. In addition, the plant would pollute the air, water, and soil of local communities.</p> <p>This plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year and this is not counting the emissions produced in construction, shipping and burning of this fuel in Asia..</p> <p>If our BC. Gov't is sincere in reaching its climate targets, this project would certainly render these targets impossible.</p> <p>In view of future generations of BC residents and their healthy environment, I sincerely urge that this project be rejected as proposed.</p> <p>Art Johnson Kamloops Sincerely, Art Johnson, Kamloops cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
418	2017-02-18	Kelly Barbin	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please protect our salmon and our oceans We depend on you to be leaders in environmental protection We expect decisions to be based on proven evidence based science Our family urges you to honour our planet not just the economy Sincerely, Kelly Barbin, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
419	2017-02-18	Gord Lehman	<p>Dear EAO, Fracking! Really, this does more damage than good and could (probably) ruin the spawning grounds there, and put peoples environment and water supply in danger. Please don't</p> <p>Sincerely, Gord Lehman, Cranbrook cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
420	2017-02-18	J Churcher	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the building of Aurora LNG which will imperil spawning salmon of the Skeena estuary and numerous other bird species that rely on the rich ecosystem of the area. (and to the other species that interact with the bird and fish species)</p> <p>Gas flaring, roads and their construction, noise, tankers and potential catastrophes will destroy habitat and threaten already-challenged species.</p> <p>This is all in addition to the fact that we have a real climate crisis and our natural resources are more precious than ever.</p> <p>I am also opposed to fracking which contaminates our water system and precipitates tectonic activity.</p> <p>We should be investing in clean energy and technologies that allow us to live in harmony with the natural world on which we depend.</p> <p>The project threatens human communities as well as the natural heritage on which their culture and lives are built.</p> <p>I cannot overstate my opposition to this project. And cannot articulate all of the well-founded reasons this is a poorly-conceived project (e.g. international siting standards)</p> <p>Get creative rather destructive.</p> <p>I will not support a government that favours industry and destruction ahead of lasting, conservative policy direction.</p> <p>Respectfully yours, Sincerely, J Churcher, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
421	2017-02-18	Virginia Smith	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>First of all, fracking for natural gas has been proven to be a huge detriment to our environment.</p> <p>Secondly, there is no profit to be gained by exporting LNG at this time, so why is Petronas even going ahead with this disaster-in-the-making? And why are we even getting involved with Petronas, a corrupt foreign corporation that should be avoided like the plague?</p> <p>Finally, building a LNG plant in this location is a very real threat to our wild salmon. We cannot afford to lose this valuable resource.</p> <p>Sincerely, Virginia Smith, Summerland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
422	2017-02-18	Ted Fishman	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Ted Fishman, San Jose cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
423	2017-02-18	Susan Tillett	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Tillett, Millbay B.C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
424	2017-02-18	Simone Cotterill	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please hear the people's plea against the Aurora LNG plant. Not only does the plant threaten BC's beautiful salmon and a plethora of wildlife that rely on this bay, but it would be a grave mistake for our planet as it would accelerate climate change. Make the decision toward a cleaner energy future and away from dirty fracked gas.</p> <p>Sincerely, Simone Cotterill, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>

425	2017-02-18	Len Shaw	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I agree with the Sierra Club, David Suzuki Foundation and other groups and individuals. Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens our climate</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Truly, Len Shaw Sincerely, Len Shaw, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
426	2017-02-18	John Beecing	<p>Dear EAO, Aura LNG Threatens Community Health and Safety. Also it will be close to a fault line and will no doubt cause quakes..</p> <p>The C government need to cancel LNG plans before it is too late. BC citizens will suffer but government must take the blame!</p> <p>John Beecing, Demob. WW II RCAF WO1 Sincerely, John Beecing, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
427	2017-02-18	trina rowles	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, trina rowles, vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
428	2017-02-18	Casey Como	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please...no fracking ! There is a wealth of information and data showing the extreme effects that fracking can and often does have on aquifers, tectonics, and water quality. Associated with this kind of industrial development there are also significant surface impacts on erosion, sedimentation, wildlife corridors and increased access by humans on the new industrial roads into wild areas.</p> <p>Increased marine traffic and the associated impact on marine wildlife from turbulence, discharges from marine vessels, shoreline development and the inevitable potential for shipwreck should be of the utmost concern.</p> <p>Do not approve this development.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely, Casey Como, Lumby cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
429	2017-02-18	Kevin Beatty	<p>Dear EAO, please defend our wildlife and natural habitats so that future generations may enjoy the pristine beauty of the world that we live in. I believe that fracking and fossil fuel usage is destroying our planet.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kevin Beatty, victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

430	2017-02-18	Stefano Gay	<p>Dear EAO, I've moved in BC from Italy because of the untamed Nature of this entire region. Then I came to know the bountyfull beauty of the Northern region thanks to the Travel Company I've started in 2007. I was able to bring here so many italian who are eager to know places like British Columbia caratherized by such precious environment. Among them many fisherman who enjoy the annual festival of the returning of the Pacific Salmonids.. Nowhere is possible to assist to such kind of massive event like in the Skeena valley and in the Rivers that cross this blessed territory. Please sirs, do not put in danger our beautiful land and environment with a risky,uncertain and dangerous project that could benefit just a little compare to the vaste loss that it can provoke. I'm sure that you realize that such important decision will effect not only the local environment, but it will ruin the international consideration that Canada and British Columbia has gained during its entire life history thanks among the nations. Thank you for your support of Beautiful British Columbia. Stefano Gay Manager director Le Reve House Adventure 3206 6th West Ave. V6K 1X8 Vancouver British Columbia Canada Sincerely, Stefano Gay, vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
431	2017-02-18	Gloria Picchetti	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Gloria Picchetti, Chicago cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
432	2017-02-18	isabelle boiscgard	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, isabelle boiscgard, st-raymond cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
433	2017-02-18	Caspar Davis	<p>Dear EAO, This summer I visited the Skeena and Bulkley Rivers, and Prince Rupert for the first time. I do not understand how the province can consider approving an LNG plant at Prince Rupert that would gravely threaten the salmon runs in these rivers, and whose greenhouse gas emissions would make the province's climate goals completely unattainable.. Which is worse, a government that denies the settled science of human caused climate change, or one that purports to accept the science but roars ahead with greenjose gas expansion anyway? Sincerely, Caspar Davis, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
434	2017-02-18	Waine Ryzak	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Waine Ryzak, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
435	2017-02-18	Neal Devine	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Neal Devine, Gainesville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
436	2017-02-18	Mairy Beam	<p>Dear EAO, There is too much risk in building the Aurora LNG beside Delusion Bay as the bay provides critical habitat for salmon. Also Digby Island's wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds. If you are not moved by the plight of fish and birds, please consider the risk to the drinking water, air and soil of the First Nations and other persons living in the area. In fact, all of us will be affected by the greenhouse gas emissions. Please say no to the Aurora LNG! Sincerely, Mairy Beam, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
437	2017-02-18	Daphne Gagnon	<p>Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Please protect the community Health and Safety as well! Please note that the country of Scotland has banded LNG programs from the entire country due to the havoc and destruction that follows in communities around the world. It's time Canada took a similar stand! We can make a start by saving our Salmon, and this fragile, important region of BC. Thank you, Sincerely, Daphne Gagnon, Coquitlam, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

438	2017-02-18	richard fairfield	Dear EAO, Don't let the Chinese or anyone else destroy your country environmentally or politically. You never know who you're gonna let in. Sincerely, richard fairfield, Santa Rosa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
439	2017-02-18	David Simard	Dear EAO, I grew up in Prince Rupert and know how important a role industry plays in such a small and remote community. My family had to leave after the government cracked down on commercial fishing in the late 90's due to severe over-fishing and the lack of proper monitoring of its impact. Although I understand that the Aurora LNG plant will bring new jobs and career opportunities for locals (and the LNG exports bringing in a pretty penny for the provincial and federal governments), I consider it to be an irreversible and irresponsible step in the wrong direction. Not only will it destroy an immensely crucial salmon spawning habitat, which will negatively effect the fishing industry as well as the health of so many communities who depend on salmon as a food source, it will ripple throughout the entire ecosystem as salmon are a keystone species that nourish wildlife and fertilize the forest. If this link in the chain is broken, we will see the effects all across the board. My other main reason for opposing this project is the short sighted nature of our ever-increasing investment in the fossil fuel industry. This is not the way forward, but a desperate attempt by the fossil fuel corporations to wring the last bit of money out of our land before the band stops playing. The reality of this desperation will be made all the more obvious to me and all others opposed when they pressure you to disregard our opposition. When the people are united against big oil & gas, and when the environmental track record of these moguls leaves no reasonable belief in their moral character and responsibility, I hope that you will have the backbone to do your duty and to protect the people and the environment they call home, happiness, and livelihood. Sincerely, David Simard, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.
440	2017-02-18	Michael Lewis	Dear EAO We must get our collective head out of the sand. The science is very clear : we cannot invest in new fossil fuel infrastructure and expand fossil fuel production if we want to have any chance of keeping anywhere near two degrees. The science is there. Anybody can read it. One need not be a scientist to understand the implications. They are disastrous. Moreover, the empirical data streaming in from high Arctic is clearly indicating past projections are being outstripped; arctic melting is happening much more quickly than ever predicted. For the provincial government to continuously mislead, indeed lie to the B.C. citizens about this aspect of the issue is unacceptable. When one adds the other risks associated with the local ecology, species impacts, the compromising of aboriginal rights plus the GHG and environmental impacts from its production, transport and consumption, there is little other than short term benefits to recommend this project. Given this, from a moral perspective, it is incumbent for the B.C. government squarely face the fact they are placing the burden of risk on present and future generations, a burden that will continue to compromise the basis for all living beings, now and well into the future. We cannot pretend to treat any project such as this as an isolated entity. We are all connected, interdependent and is an unprecedented crises. Choose life and get on with the transition off of fossil fuels. It is the only responsible choice, scientifically or morally. Sincerely, Michael Lewis, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
441	2017-02-18	Kristin Kagerer	Dear EAO, It is imperative that the Aurora LNG gas plant does not get built. This is not only an extremely dangerous enterprise in general, posing severe environmental impacts damaging to our planet and our peoples lives, but it is detrimental to the survival of the Skeena salmon. I urge BC's Environmental Assessment Office to "Say No" to this hazardous project. Sincerely, Kristin Kagerer Pointe-Claire, Qc Sincerely, Kristin Kagerer, Pointe-Claire cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
442	2017-02-18	George Payerle	Dear EAO, This madness must end! Protecting our fish resources is so much more important than furthering Christy Clark's LNG ambitions! Sincerely, George Payerle, Roberts Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
443	2017-02-18	Mitraneer Chatterjee	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Mitraneer Chatterjee, North York cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
444	2017-02-18	Julia Mckenzie	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Julia Mckenzie, Salt spring island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
445	2017-02-18	christina little	Dear EAO, Please will protect salmon if you do not. Sincerely, christina little, Mount Laurel cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
446	2017-02-18	Jim Stelfox	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Jim Stelfox, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

447	2017-02-18	Sara Golling	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of human industry are killing so much of our biosphere. When do we say "enough!?" The north coast of BC is home to a rich variety of life; but only as long as we leave natural habitat undisturbed. And only as long as climate change happens slowly.</p> <p>Developing more and more LNG, permitting more fracking, more pipelines, more movement of fossil fuels to foreign markets will not slow climate change -- rather, it will accelerate it, and exacerbate economic costs associated with extreme weather events and the other sequelae of climate change.</p> <p>The LNG plant proposed for Lelu Island would be a disaster for the Skeena salmon and all the other lies that depend on them -- human, animal, and even plant populations will suffer. Now, it may be that the Digby Island proposal would be marginally less damaging for the Skeena salmon, but it will be no less damaging in terms of climate change, and it will displace other precious wildlife.</p> <p>Why are we in such a hurry to destroy our biosphere? It's extremely depressing to those of us who have no say, who know that "public input" is mere therapy for those who express opinions, and that our valid concerns will not be counted by The People Who Count (the real rulers of our country, the owners of more wealth than anyone needs) -- history will prove us to have been correct, but by then it will be too late.</p> <p>But I ask you, anyway, for what it's worth, to please consider cumulative impacts, and decline further LNG plants.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sara Golling, Rossland, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
448	2017-02-18	Kim Herdman	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Kim Herdman, Williams Lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
449	2017-02-18	E Mark Barker	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please listen to the stewards of the land and waters being effected by the planned Aurora LNG plant.</p> <p>This plant should not be built.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, E Mark Barker, Canmore, AB cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
450	2017-02-18	Steeve Caron	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I write this letter to tell my opposition to this project. It's not by burning more fossil fuels that we will achieve our goals of being fossil fuel free!! This project is in contradiction to the environment and the society well being and as such must be terminated.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Steeve Caron Sincerely, Steeve Caron, Chase cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
451	2017-02-18	Thomas Mueller	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I say NO to Aurora LNG!</p> <p>Regards. Thomas Mueller Sincerely, Thomas Mueller, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
452	2017-02-18	Janet Pattinson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed Aurora LNG plant on Digby Island.</p> <p>This project would endanger the steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon that move through the area. It would interfere with the migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and all the varieties of songbirds using the wetlands of Digby Island on their migrations.</p> <p>Such a plant would pollute the land, air and water of the area.</p> <p>something that is regularly forgotten by those interested in industrial development is the total ecosystem. There is a lack of understanding of how we are all entwined in the whole. Destruction of the environment, loss of biodiversity, all have an impact on the health of the people as well as the wildlife. This plant, planned for the benefit of the people of China, will have great negative impacts on the people of BC. There is more to quality of life than money.</p> <p>Sincerely, Janet Pattinson, Sorrento cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>



453	2017-02-18	Brian Cutts	<p>Dear EAO,  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b>  The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.  Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>  The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.  The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.  The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.  Sincerely,  Brian Cutts, Nelson  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.  Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.  Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
454	2017-02-18	Daniel L. Harris	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Daniel L. Harris, Medford  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
455	2017-02-18	Loeuil Regine	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Loeuil Regine, Hamoir  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
456	2017-02-18	Lisa Neste	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Lisa Neste, High point  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
457	2017-02-18	Jonathon Stanton	<p>Dear EAO,  Please vote no to Aurora LNG's fracking proposal and vote a yes to BC's heritage - salmon. Fracking is an aggregious, environmental disaster and should be banned outright throughout Canada. It lays waste our legacy wealth - clean water, environment, wildlife, etc.  Please listen and respect the voters and say NO to AURORA LNG!  Respectfully,  Jonathon S.  Sincerely,  Jonathon STanton, Toronto  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
458	2017-02-18	lesley woodley	<p>Dear EAO,  Sustainability of environment and resources is of key importance to me and my family. We cannot continue to think and plan in terms of years in office...we need to think generationally.  LNG is messy and forever removes water form the cycle. it is not clean power contrary to propoganda.  I want a clean healthy environment for my grandchild and her children to come. A safely abundant natural ecosystem that includes the salmon that are so much an icon of BC.  There are so many GREEN industries that offer power for humans and safe healthy environments for wildlife.Please don't sell my grand daughter future for short term greed and votes..  Sincerely,  lesley woodley, surrey  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

459	2017-02-18	Diane Kennedy	<p>Dear EAO, Stop Aurora LNG because it threatens salmon and wildlife in addition to community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Sincerely, Diane Kennedy, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
460	2017-02-18	Patti Johnston	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Patti Johnston, Ladysmith cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
461	2017-02-18	Alejandra Proano	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Alejandra Proano, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
462	2017-02-18	Sam Holm	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sam Holm, Milwaukee cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
463	2017-02-18	Line Ringgaard	<p>Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Line Ringgaard Sincerely, Line Ringgaard, Herring cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
464	2017-02-18	Kevin Belanger	<p>Dear EAO, Please work to protect critical salmon habitat from the detrimental effects of careless industrial development. isn't it possible to find a safer place to operate large industrial projects? Instead of just getting to 'yes' for multinational shareholders of a company, why don't we get to 'yes' for all stakeholders including local residents, the wider BC population, and the pristine environment that we should all be proud to protect, not exploit. Risking transportation costs will soon make exporting LNG from BC to China completely nonsensical. Why are we investing billions in a dying technology with a dirty legacy? Why don't we instead lead the world in alternative-energy solutions? Solar, wind and geothermal are all perfectly viable solutions whose costs are falling rapidly.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sincerely, Kevin Belanger, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

465	2017-02-18	RM, DE, SL Salmon	Dear EAO, We wish to express our thoughts that everything that can be done to save environment must be done. Responsible action is needed. We expect your affiliations to work to that end. Sincerely, RM, DE, SL Salmon, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
466	2017-02-18	Sheila Pratt	Dear EAO, You already know why the Aurora LNG plant should NOT be built beside Delusion Bay. I wonder if you understand why Brexit and Donald Trump happened. Politicians have been telling us things that have finally caught up with them. This plant would threaten the community's health and safety and of course the whole project will only add to climate change. Isn't it time you do the right thing for British Columbians and our environment and not for corporations? Sincerely, Sheila Pratt, Maple Ridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
467	2017-02-18	Shelley McKeachie	Dear EAO, I'm opposed to the Aurora LNG plant which would be built next to Delusion Bay for the following reasons: 1) it would damage critical habitat for salmon, migrating birds, bird nesting areas and harbour porpoise which are a species of special concern. 2) this plant's annual 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions would use up more than the entire BC legislated carbon budget. This is irresponsible in the face of the serious consequences of climate change. 3) free prior and informed consent has not been given by the First Nations whose food security, community health and cultural heritage would be threatened by this plant. This project should not proceed without it. 4) this plant would pollute the local communities pristine air, drinking water and soil. 5) the siting of this plant would violate international siting standards. Please do not give the Aurora LNG Plant approval to proceed. Sincerely, Shelley McKeachie Sincerely, Shelley McKeachie, Denman Is. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
468	2017-02-18	L Pearson	Dear EAO, In my lifetime I've seen such a decrease in the salmon population. Our Fraser is dying from 1000 cuts. Please don't open up the Skeena to the same woes. This is not progress. Sincerely, L Pearson, Mission cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
469	2017-02-18	Conny Rohr	Dear EAO, We just git that one earth. There have to be other ways to generate energie. Too many species are already distinguished. Plese don't build the Aurora LNG, as we all know the risk of fracking. Sincerely, Conny Rohr, Shawnigan lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
470	2017-02-18	A Hermann Kerr	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG is just bad news for the Skeena river fishery. When it come to making a decision between fossil fuel and food then food should win every time. We are in an environmental crisis we need to stop this insanity. Hermann Kerr Canoe, BC V0E1K0 250-832-1927 Sincerely, A Hermann Kerr, Canoe cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

471	2017-02-18	Christopher Heuman	<p>Dear EAO,AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christopher Heuman, ELBURN cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
472	2017-02-18	Ed and Jan jan	<p>Dear EAO. how can you even contemplate an LNG plant that would disrupt the Skeena salmon?on are an important part of the Eco system many creatures including humans rely on them.When we have a government who can only think of jobs even for foreign owned companies how can our fragile environment survive?</p> <p>Sincerely, Ed and Jan jan, saltspringsland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
473	2017-02-18	Jeanne Denee	<p>Dear EAO, AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON, WILDLIFE, COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY, AND OUR CLIMATE.</p> <p>This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Stop it now.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeanne Denee, Lantzville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
474	2017-02-18	Joan DeBella	<p>Dear EAO, British Columbia has such beautiful and unique habitats for wildlife. I cannot understand that the government values greed over common sense. To pollute this area is wrong and to not take into account the carbon emissions causing global warming is criminal. We need to protect our water, oceans, wetlands, and air, instead of putting them at risk for oil spills. When are our elected officials going to smarten up and understand that being stewards of our province doesn't mean to put it at risk. Please. Say NO to Aurora LNG. Future voters will remember how you protected our inheritance. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joan DeBella, Vernon cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
475	2017-02-18	david lock	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, david lock, victoria, bc cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
476	2017-02-18	Dane Allison	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Dane Allison, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
477	2017-02-18	Connie Duchene	<p>Dear EAO, I am very concerned about the proposed Aurora LNG fracked gas plant by Nexen.</p> <p>As I'm sure you know, this plant would be built by Delusion Bay, a critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. Aurora LNG would pose too many unacceptable risks to these salmon.</p> <p>The nearby Digby Island provides important habitat for many migrating birds, including geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses along their migration routes. And then there is the damage caused by the road, plant construction, acidification of the air and water, and the noise.</p> <p>And then there is the threatened health and safety of the people living in the local communities, from the noise, the light, air and water pollution. The list of hazards is so long! Collisions in and around Prince Rupert Harbour, grounding of vessels, oil spills, the destruction of lucrative fishing grounds...and last but not least, this plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions a year!</p> <p>No! This is not acceptable. Please do not allow this project to go ahead.</p> <p>Sincerely, Connie Duchene, Chester cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

478	2017-02-18	Roddy Tasaka	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>My name is Roddy Isao Tasaka. I was born in Prince Rupert off of Digby Island where the proposed LNG plant is set to be constructed. My concern, like many others, are for the protection of the salmon habitat. I take a personal stance in this as I am from a long line of Japanese Canadian commercial fisherman that have been given the life we have because of the Skeena estuary.</p> <p>My grandfather was a commercial fisherman that also built over 100 boats in the fleet and had his shop seized during the war. One of his boats, the Nishga girl, will be on display in Gatineau at the Canadian Museum of History <a href="http://www.historymuseum.ca/media/nishga-girl-to-be-presented-in-future-canadian-museum-of-history/">http://www.historymuseum.ca/media/nishga-girl-to-be-presented-in-future-canadian-museum-of-history/</a> I am currently being commissioned by the NAJC to produce a graphic novel for the museum on the legacy of the industry, the losses during the war, the connection between the Japanese and Native community and what my Grandfather accomplished during his life. The Skeena is essential to this story.</p> <p>My connection to the land, the people and the resource of salmon for the lives and community has been an integral part my family, the community and for the global export of Pacific Northwest Salmon. For well over a decade the fishing industry has declined and the struggle to make a living as a fisherman and providing for families has also declined heavily. I recently returned from 3 years of traveling in Southeast Asia to Prince Rupert to reconnect and truly appreciate this great land that is second to none. I fished with my father for the first time in years. To see directly both the beauty and the legacy of the Skeena river and what it means to the community and the world is beyond words.</p> <p>However, I will try to make my case. If LNG has the potential to destroy this habitat this should be taken very seriously as it speaks to a much bigger picture. I am not an environmentalist or a biologist but I have directly witnessed the decline of salmon as it stands today but renewed hope this year to see a healthier return in years. The salmon finally have a chance to increase in numbers and replenish an industry that is not just a commercial operation but a human one. The Skeena and Salmon are like bloodlines to the earth, the animals and the people. While I understand the potential benefit this may bring financially, the cost is higher than dollar value if there is ANY risk to a disruption and destruction of the Salmon habitat.</p> <p>As the world stands today, with US politics showing what greed, money and power can do to a country and its people, I know Canadians as a whole care about the land as the #1 priority over everything else. I don't believe anyone can make a 100% claim that building a gas line or any construction close to a crucial and sensitive estuary would not affect the migration of the salmon and their survival habitat.</p> <p>The greenhouse gases emitting 6.7 million tonnes of emissions are alone devastating. Coming from Asia to Vancouver/Rupert, the main definitive difference is in the quality of air. Pollute the air, pollute the people, pollute life. It quite literally kills people.</p> <p>I had actually met the Princess from the family that owns Petronas by pure coincidence on my travels.. She was wise and very kind. Had I known then what I know now I would have addressed this with her. I can guarantee one trip out on fishing boat to see what we are trying to save would change her mind on any harm done to this species and the pureness of this great land.</p> <p>I trust you have done your thorough assessments in all areas and I would also have to trust that the decision is based solely on a human one, not a financial one. New to working in a federal industry, I see that people here are just people. No different than you or me. I don't have the background or the position to make a call on this but the power of the internet allows anyone to have a voice. This is mine and I hope it is received. Its crucial that you ar</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
479	2017-02-18	Barbara Illerbrun	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It is difficult to understand a government that continues to risk BC's natural resources for the benefit of other countries and votes. No one believes in the endless job pit with these short term vote getting brownie points that turn up at election time. I don't care about big companies who claim to supply us with jobs. They don't care about people or the environment and either does this Social credit dinosaur political party.</p> <p>I worked in the north for many years and it is clear this government sees the north as a resource base for the south. The south never really sees the damage our luxurious lifestyles do to the environment.</p> <p>It is hard to write people such as yourself anymore as you don't listen and don't care . You are people that take care of yourselves first. I am ashamed of our government (both) . Leave the north coast alone!!</p> <p>Please stop destroying BC! Go away! Sincerely, Barbara Illerbrun, Powell River BC</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns.</p>
480	2017-02-18	marcelle roy	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am dismayed that another massive fracked gas plant is being proposed by Nexen just north of the Skeena estuary. This insane project must no be approved. Firstly it makes no economic sense as the cost to produce fracked gas is at least 3 times higher than its market value. Secondly we will never meet our GHG reduction targets as LNG has been proven by scientists to be worse than coal as vast amounts of methane are released in the process never mind considering the full cycle of producing, shipping, transporting and burning of it in Asia. Thirdly Digby Island provides important habitat for migrating birds and is too close to Delusion Bay's critical salmon habitat. That zone is invaluable to the survival of salmon which are a crucial food source for First Nations and all of us as well as a source of income and an huge source of revenue from tourism for this province. Why jeopardize all this bounty and beauty, the health and safety of local communities for a faili ng Chinese industry. There is no social license for this unnecessary destruction.</p> <p>Sincerely, marcelle roy, salt spring island</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
481	2017-02-18	Esther Neville	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I understand that you are assessing the option to approve an LNG plant on Digby Island. Please do not approve this - LNG is not the way of the future, it should be left in the past. The potential damage that this will do is just not worth it - risks to wildlife, communities, the environment - we have to say no to LNG and protect our environment. Please do that for our future!</p> <p>Sincerely, Esther Neville, North Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
482	2017-02-18	Robert Paille	<p>Dear EAO, resource.</p> <p>I am opposed to the Aurora LNG project simply because it is a dire threat to a natural resource dependent on that area, namely the Skeena River Salmon.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Paille, Salmon Arm</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

483	2017-02-18	Marie-Eve Tremblay	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marie-Eve Tremblay, Mont-Saint-Hilaire cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
484	2017-02-18	Paula Simmons	Dear EAO, Please protect the salmon and wildlife and stop Aurora LNG. You could be the example the world needs, and not cave to the big oil industry like the U.S. has done Sincerely, Paula Simmons, Cookeville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
485	2017-02-18	LaDonna MacRae	Dear EAO, To allow this LNG plant to be built would be a mistake rippling down the years and affecting generations of citizens! The risks are simply too great and too long lasting to even consider. Really? Is it worth this risk to the health, to the environment to countless generations? If you are honest with yourself you will agree it is not worth those risks and say NO! Thank you Sincerely, LaDonna MacRae, Salmon Arm cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
486	2017-02-18	enzo mulas	Dear EAO, Sincerely, enzo mulas, florence cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
487	2017-02-18	Karen King	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Karen King, London cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman Susan Nelson	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
488	2017-02-18	Susan Nelson	Dear EAO, In this interdependent world all life is affected when one life is affected. So many lives depend depend on salmon and the Skeena river must be protected. We need to use energy sources that do not put other species and ourselves at risk. Sincerely, Susan Nelson, Shirley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
489	2017-02-18	Robert Arnold	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Robert Arnold, Victoria, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
490	2017-02-18	Judy Goodman	Dear EAO, A billion young salmon are at risk from the fracking gas plant to be built near Prince Rupert. Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Please protect this area from a fracking plant Sincerely, Judy Goodman, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.

491	2017-02-18	Iorne Berman	<p>Dear EAO</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens our climate</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would completely blow our carbon budget and destroy a promise for a more carbon neutral future for our planet and its inhabitants.</p> <p>Sincerely, Iorne Berman, Sechelt BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
492	2017-02-18	Edwin Ochmanek	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I urge you to reject the application for Aurora LNG as it is neither in the long term interests of British Columbia or Canadians as a whole. Our salmon are already under threat, and with them life as we know it in the rainforest and surrounding waters.</p> <p>Furthermore, LNG is terribly carbon intensive, and as oil sands pipelines are already going to make it impossible to meet our legally binding goals for carbon reduction, we must not allow any more fossil fuel expansion - period. (and this isn't even taking into account the methane released from the fracking process nor the excessive amount of water made toxic during extraction.</p> <p>This development also threatens the health and safety of the surrounding community.</p> <p>The signs on the wall are clear - the economy of the future will not be carbon based. For Canadians to be competitive, we must put all of our efforts into developing the economy of the future, not the economy of the past in the name of short term profit.</p> <p>Thank you for doing everything in your power to see that this project does not go through.</p> <p>Sincerely, Edwin Ochmanek, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
493	2017-02-18	Hilary Jones	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I oppose this project for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would increase greenhouse gas emissions, from the construction to the processing to the final consumption</li> <li>2. Fracking is very destructive, contaminates groundwater and increases earthquakes</li> <li>3. This project would endanger critical salmon habitat</li> <li>4. It would also destroy pristine wilderness areas.</li> </ol> <p>Sincerely, Hilary Jones, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

494	2017-02-18	Kenneth Schadt	<p>Dear EAO,  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b>  The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.  Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>  The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.  The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.  The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.  Kenneth  Sincerely,  Kenneth Schadt, Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.  Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.  Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
495	2017-02-18	Lynne York	<p>Dear EAO,  Not only is fracking anywhere a bad idea, it is especially troubling to do so in a known salmon habitat.  Please don't go the way of the United States and put money and poor environmental policies before this beautiful land and all species who call it home.  Please say "NO" TO AURORA LNG.  Thank You.  Sincerely,  Lynne York, Salt Spring Island  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
496	2017-02-18	Richard Kuehn	<p>Dear EAO,  Please THINK OF THE SEVENTH GENERATION! Fracking pollutes large quantities of precious water. You can't drink polluted water or bring back lost salmon runs..  Sincerely,  Richard Kuehn, Council  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
497	2017-02-18	Al Varty	<p>Dear EAO,  Don't kill our province for profits of foreign corporations. Salmon are under threat from salmon farms. And now from a LNG plant. Give the wild salmon a chance.  <b>STOP THE NONSENSE</b>  <b>PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT</b>  Sincerely,  Al Varty, Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
498	2017-02-18	Ean Langille	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Ean Langille, Penticton  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>



499	2017-02-18	Marie Danna	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Aurora LNG threatens our climate As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget Sincerely, Marie Danna, Ridgefield cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
500	2017-02-18	Kim Hancock	<p>Dear EAO, Please save the Skeena River estuary where young salmon become the future food and support the economy of northern BC. DElusion Bay is critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye. The LNG fantasy is far less important than the beautiful and natural continuation of species that live on our coast. Water is life and respect for First Nation lively hood and their consent should take precedence over environmental destruction. Sincerely Kim Hancock Sincerely, Kim Hancock, Coombs cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
501	2017-02-18	Rebecca Hazell	<p>Dear EAO, I am deeply concerned: Aurora LNG is irresponsibly ignoring the impact that building a fracked gas plant beside Delusion Bay will have on the environmental health and the economy of BC. First, the plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Salmon are vital to the BC economy and the world economy--a threat to them is counter to our needs. Next, such a processing plant threatens our drinking water, air and soil. Would you drink polluted water? Give it to your children? I doubt it, so why allow any corporation to put any part of our population at risk? The owners of Nexen will not suffer these effects; they don't live in BC and have no reason to care what happens to it. Our land's riches are just resources to be gobbled up, and Nexen has no investment in the well-being of the inhabitants of our province. Fracked gas is already an environmental disaster; adding a plant to process it adds insult to injury. And do remember: natural gas is a finite resource. No matter what we do to get more of it, we will only end up with less of it. Instead of relying on a dwindling and irreplaceable resource, you should be supporting initiatives to build infrastructure for alternative energies like solar, wind, geothermal, and water kinetics. Think not only clean energy but more and better jobs. A final observation: by the time such a facility as this processing plant would be built, it would already be obsolete. Canada and BC in particular needs to be a world leader in developing sane, practical alternatives to the dying gas and oil industry. Here is your chance to turn in the right direction. Sincerely, Rebecca Hazell, Duncan BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
502	2017-02-18	Earl Richards	<p>Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG plant has to be kept away from populated areas, just in case there another Refugio, Texas-type, explosion. Sincerely, Earl Richards, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
503	2017-02-18	Cecelia Keyes	<p>Dear EAO, We need to keep this plant from being built. There is too much at risk. Ocean life and the life in the neighbouring wetlands would be destroyed. We can not take this risk. Life is worth protecting. Sincerely, Cecelia Keyes, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

504	2017-02-18	Sarah Giles	Dear EAO, I care about BC's wild salmon population, and I say NO to the Aurora LNG!! Sincerely, Sarah Giles, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
505	2017-02-18	Megan Adams	Dear EAO, I write as a scientist and a citizen to urge you to reconsider the siting of the Aurora LNG plant. Decades of research indicate the importance of Delusion Bay as part of the broader Skeena nearshore environment. This region is an integral nursery for steelhead, coho, and sockeye. Leadership from Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Nations indicate the ecological and cultural importance of the region, as well, as evidenced by their involvement in research and in community-driven blockades. These are efforts based on commitment and respect to place. To zoom out, British Columbia participating in the LNG industry contravenes our commitment to reductions in carbon emissions. I am constantly disappointed by the two-faced nature of this government: the values you claim are not reflected at all in your actions. This is especially true for the Skeena and Peace regions. This was your chance to demonstrate meaningful resource management after decades of mismanagement in British Columbia. Show us your ability to lead with innovation! My thanks, Sincerely, Megan Adams, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
506	2017-02-18	Karen Naiman	Dear EAO, NO Aurora LNG! It threatens Salmon and Wildlife! It threatens the Climate! It threatens Community Health and Safety! Sincerely, Karen Naiman, Denver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
507	2017-02-18	james welscott	Dear EAO, The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food. Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Sincerely, james welscott, whitehorse cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
508	2017-02-18	G. Barry Stewart	Dear EAO, I am writing to express my support for Skeena wild salmon ' and my opposition to any industry that will threaten the salmon's survival, such as LNG plants. Sincerely, G. Barry Stewart, Chilliwack cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
509	2017-02-18	Shayna Hornstein	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is massive. It's a fracked gas plant being built right near Prince Rupert on Digby Island. BUT more important, more critical about this spot and why I write to you is that Aurora LNG is just north of the Skeena estuary. Skeena estuary is where up to a BILLION young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. A BILLION YOUNG SALMON. This plant will compromise our food supply and that of the land wildlife. Do not build Aurora LNG. I, along with growing numbers of other British Columbian voters are watching this project especially closely. Thank you for paying attention to this request. Sincerely, Sincerely, Shayna Hornstein, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
510	2017-02-18	Jesse Morpaw	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Jesse Morpaw, Ottawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
511	2017-02-18	Laura Kirkhope	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Laura Kirkhope, Cranbrook cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

512	2017-02-18	David Ham	<p>Dear EAO, I see that Aurora LNG threatens Salmon and wildlife. The risks posed by this project are too many. Please to not allow it to proceed.</p> <p>David ham Sincerely, David Ham, Lasqueti Is. BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
513	2017-02-18	Don Harrison	<p>Dear EAO, Is there no one among you that is familiar with the north coast of B.C.???? Is there even one of you that have actually lived or traveled in this area?? If not I suggest that before you make critical decisions like this you go to the area and ask questions of the locals. I know that it is the only way to decide. Go kick some tires</p> <p>Sincerely, Don Harrison, Ladysmith B.C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
514	2017-02-18	Steen Larsen	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is ill advised threatens salmon, the environment and wildlife.</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.</p> <p>The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens our climate</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>I say no to Aurora LNG. This is an election issue for me.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steen Larsen, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
515	2017-02-18	Robert Baker	<p>Dear EAO, The Skeena watershed is one of the last remaining major life sustaining watersheds in the North Pacific providing sustenance to most of the people, and the health of the trees and wildlife in the entire Skeena Region. What is the rationale for risking all this for something that has several suitable sites away from both the Skeena and Fraser watersheds? What kind of madness is this? The carbon industry is a cyclical, high risk and pathogenic industry that is falling out of favor fast. Please don't allow the short term gains blind you to the risks and side effects of this completely unwholesome decision. The Skeena and Fraser fisheries, and the timber produced by healthy watersheds has built and sustained British Columbia. Please wake up from whatever influence you're under and protect the most important of all our resources.</p> <p>Regards, Robert Baker Sincerely, Robert Baker, Masset cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
516	2017-02-18	Agnes Watts	<p>Dear EAO, Even if this proposed LNG plant was not going to be located in a place that will destroy vital salmon habitat, it would still be a terrible idea because LNG is a fossil fuel, which we need to be eliminating, not expanding our reliance on., and even if LNG was not harmful, fracking as a method for getting it out of the ground is a disaster waiting to happen, everywhere it's being extracted. This plant should not be allowed to proceed. China is not content with poisoning its own people with toxic pollution. Now it's attempting to do it to B.C. Do your job. Say no to this (literally!) horrible idea.</p> <p>Sincerely, Agnes Watts, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
517	2017-02-18	Deanne Pala	<p>Dear EAO, NO BUILDING PLEASE PRESERVE !</p> <p>Sincerely, Deanne Pala, Alliston cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

518	2017-02-18	Louise Bjorknas	Dear EAO, All information we hear on the news talk about the tremendous stresses upon salmon along the west coast. To support them we need to preserve their habitat, not threaten them with pollution by the proposed Aurora gas plant. Government's role needs to go beyond mere support for business into a true comprehension of the value of the natural world and respect for First Nations right for food security. Do not approve the Aurora LNG plant on Digby Island. Sincerely, Louise Bjorknas, White Rock cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
519	2017-02-18	Y Webb	Dear EAO,The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Our salmon are precious. Please give them priority Sincerely, Y Webb, N vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
520	2017-02-18	Jane Mertz	Dear EAO, The economy at any cost has to be stopped. We are ruining critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon, by building unnecessary industrial complexes that will benefit few people from BC. The salmon are a keystone to the environment, our large marine predators depend on the salmon as do the land-based predators - the grizzlies. Please stop this plant. Sincerely, Jane Mertz, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
521	2017-02-18	Hilary Leighton	Dear EAO, It is time for us to begin to view the natural world (of which we are an extension) as kin. If we substitute the word "resource" for "relative", how easily would it be to sell the salmon -- our relative -- downstream to short-sighted LNG? There are so many clean, green renewable energy sources -- our current government is misinformed and money- and power-hungry. Will egos ruin our eco? Please do not proceed with Aurora LNG for all our sakes. Dr. Hilary Leighton Sincerely, Hilary Leighton, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
522	2017-02-18	Andrew Collard	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG proposal does not have social license and threatens a valuable and vulnerable wetlands. Aurora LNG is in the wrong place at the wrong time. I am adding my name to those who oppose the project. Sincerely, Andrew Collard Sincerely, Andrew Collard, Sooke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
523	2017-02-18	Barb Collier	Dear EAO, I say no to Aurora LNG. We need to protect the critical salmon habitat in Delusion Bay. We need to do everything we can to keep salmon habitat healthy. Salmon provide food sources for many bird, animals and even the forests. Acidification from plant gases as well as tanker noise will also present hazards to flora, fauna and people. This habitat zone is at its highest and best use. It is critical habitat that needs to be given priority protection.. Lastly an overwhelming majority of residents do not want this project It is not in the public interest. Not building it is in the public interest!! Sincerely, Barb Collier, Bon Accord cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
524	2017-02-18	ellaina signorotto	Dear EAO, Sincerely, ellaina signorotto, kimberley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
525	2017-02-18	Vittorio Ricci	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Vittorio Ricci, genova cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
526	2017-02-18	nicolette ludolphi	Dear EAO, Sincerely, nicolette ludolphi, Gr'pelingen Bremen cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

527	2017-02-18	Marlene Alexander	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>DON'T DO IT !</p> <p>Sincerely, Marlene Alexander, LONDON cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
528	2017-02-18	Roberta Smith	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>British Columbia needs to put our efforts into clean renewable energy. We are embarrassingly behind. Our Premier is like a dog with a bone and it is obstructing her from seeing clearly. She is destroying our beautiful and bountiful province for money in her own pocket. We have enough electricity and certainly do not need to build any more fossil fuel inspired debt on the chance of selling it. If she cannot see that the fossil fuel industry is dying then we need to get rid of her as our leader</p> <p>Sincerely, Roberta Smith, Port Alberni cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
529	2017-02-18	Carol Collins	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This carbon bomb must be stopped.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife:</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety:</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens our climate:</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Please say no to Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Carol Collins, Dover cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
530	2017-02-18	Taofen Wang	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I have heard about the AURORA LNG that would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>I definitely against the this activity and we should protect our wonderful environment from such developments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Taofen Wang, Brampton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

531	2017-02-18	Bob Alexander	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. DON'T DO IT !! Sincerely, Bob Alexander, LONDON cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
532	2017-02-18	MICHAEL CARPENTER	<p>Dear EAO, NO FRACKING BY AURORA LNG Sincerely, MICHAEL CARPENTER, FISH CREEK cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
533	2017-02-18	Sonia Marino	<p>Dear EAO, The proposed Aurora LNG facility will pose a direct threat to the environment, endangered wildlife and their habitat, and the unceded territory of indigenous peoples. To build an LNG facility on such a fragile ecosystem when similar facilities in nearby Alberta are underutilized makes no economic, environmental or political sense whatsoever. Please say NO. Thank you, Sincerely, Sonia Marino, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
534	2017-02-18	Natalie Lucas	<p>Dear EAO, This is a very simple matter: life is more important than making profits. Our waterways are not solely access routes to making money. They are alive with creatures, in the water like the salmon, and around the waterways like the forest creatures. Then there are communities of people who depend on these waterways and creatures for their lives. No one should think they can bully their way into an area. Others should not allow this bullying. How can people clear across the country tell people who live here that foreigners are coming to strip their community? Think on it people. Life takes priority over profits. I speak from living in an area that has experienced exactly this. We have no salmon, our river is polluted. People get sick with cancer. Industry has not made us rich. These profits go elsewhere. Our sons and daughters travel all over the country looking for work to support their families. That's beneficial?? To who? Sincerely, Natalie Lucas, South Slokan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
535	2017-02-18	Aurora Ionescu	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Aurora Ionescu, Gatineau cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
536	2017-02-18	Alanna Hulko	<p>Dear EAO, We have an obligation to protect our wildlife and salmon spawning grounds. Corporate interests should never be put ahead of the people who live in and pay taxes in this Province. Tourism in BC is a billion dollar industry that cannot be put at risk by the potential for a disaster that would destroy another large industry that of salmon fishing, salmon canning and smoked salmon. I am utterly opposed to foreign companies being able to buy our local resources. Any resource based development should be done solely for the benefit of Canadians, as they are our resources that we did not consent to being sold. I am asking this government to act on behalf of the citizens that pay your salaries. When all of our oceans are dead, our forests gone and our food sources decimated dollar bills will not be enough to save us. That is why it is critical that you make the right decision now! Sincerely, Alanna Hulko, Sidney cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

537	2017-02-18	Joan Higgs	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The Aurora LNG must not be built because it would spell disaster for one of BC's largest salmon runs, not to mention the many bird species that migrate to the wetlands. Human health and safety are would also be put at huge risk due to industrial pollution, not to mention destruction of what makes British Columbia "super natural". Please drop this project, in the name of sanity and decency.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joan Higgs, Roberts Creek</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
538	2017-02-18	Alan Marcon	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It's time for you to do your job and stop the carbon bomb that Aurora LNG is proposing on Digby Island near Prince Rupert. It threatens salmon and wildlife. The plant is proposed to be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant also threatens community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. The plant also threatens our climate. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. In the interest of protecting the environment, including salmon and wildlife, community health and safety and our climate I ask that you prevent this fracked gas plant from being built. It's the right thing to do and you know it...</p> <p>Sincerely, a concerned citizen of Canada, Alan Marcon</p> <p>Sincerely, Alan Marcon, Sudbury</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
539	2017-02-18	Torrey Archer	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please reconsider establishing an LNG plant beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. While I understand that energy production must occur, surely there are more options - places where our livelihoods do not depend on the waters that LNG activities will likely jeopardize. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents, not to mention the local First Nation bands, were opposed to the project; without community support you cannot have a successful project. Please reconsider your siting of this LNG project to somewhere less fragile and necessary to the lives of coastal people.</p> <p>Sincerely, Torrey Archer, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
540	2017-02-18	Erica Frank	<p>As a physician specializing in preventive medicine, who moved to BC from the US in substantial part for our clean energy policy, I find this exploration makes no sense from an environmental, health, or long-term economic perspective.</p> <p>Sincerely, Erica Frank, Nanoose Bay</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
541	2017-02-18	Rickey Buttery	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Rickey Buttery, Cocoa</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
542	2017-02-18	Carolyn Chodeck	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Carolyn Chodeck, Victoria, BC</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

543	2017-02-18	Curzio Bruni	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone.</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia.</p> <p>This carbon bomb must be stopped.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your attention, I hope that some saint may help to block this project</p> <p>Best regards Curzio Bruni (Italy)</p> <p>Sincerely, Curzio Bruni, Assisi (ITA)</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
544	2017-02-18	Ben Murray	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing this to say NO! to Aurora LNG's fracking gas plant!! This foolish endeavor would risk both Skeena salmon and the community of Dodge Cove. Do the right thing, and leave short-term greed and gain in the ground where it belongs.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ben Murray, Edmonton</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
545	2017-02-18	Kevin Kish	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>As a fishing guide who works on the Bulkley River, a tributary of the Skeena, I'm worried about my livelihood with continued talk of LNG development at the mouth of the Skeena River. In my opinion the economic benefits of a healthy river, with healthy returns of salmon and steelhead, far out weigh any benefits from LNG development. This area is critical salmon and steelhead rearing habit and is part of one of the last truly great wild rivers left on our west coast. Risking the collapse of salmon and steelhead runs in this river system for the short term benefit of LNG development is similar to 'cutting off one's nose inspite their face'.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kevin Kish, Pemberton</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
546	2017-02-18	CS Symington	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>We can't afford to lose this species,</p> <p>Sincerely, CS Symington, Austin</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
547	2017-02-18	Ruth MacEachern	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The Aurora LNG threatens not only salmon and wildlife but the health and environment of us all. This project will produce almost 7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year. It will pollute the drinking water, soil and air of the local communities. Delusion Bay provides critical habitat for salmon. Please stop this enevitable disaster from coming to fruition.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ruth MacEachern, Courtenay</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
548	2017-02-18	D Lynn Chapman	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>There is no end to projects than want to use our shared environment for private profits. You absolutely MUST include the costs of lost biodiversity and ecosystem services as a criteria for evaluating this project.. there are mechanisms such as NaturalCapital Analysis that make such a cost benefit analysis workable. There's NO excuse for failing to put environmental needs at the forefront in your process and decision making.</p> <p>We need wild.salmonfor our collective survival. We need intact ecosystems for salmon to survive. There is nothing that can replace this common good. We have better alternatives for energy that don't waste our natural heritage and defile or environment.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Sincerely, D Lynn Chapman, Roberts Creek</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
549	2017-02-18	Al Cowan	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The LNG industry is being promoted by the BC liberals as a political ploy. It is NOT economically profitable except to a giant Chinese corporation. It is disastrous for the ecologically sensitive estuary where it is proposed to be built. The resulting tanker traffic poses a huge risk, and the project has not demonstrated informed consent from the indigenous people affected.</p> <p>Sincerely, Al Cowan, Nanaimo</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>



550	2017-02-18	Kate Hanen	Dear EAO, No more LNG no more fracking. Let's become leaders and innovators in renewable energy. The technology is available, it will create jobs (just as you will say to push the LNG agenda) and it will be forward thinking. We need to stop looking backwards in attempts to create a future. We must do better for our families, our province, our country. Please take a moment and reflect on the damage these projects cause, the financial and economic benefits do nothing to ease that. Please reject this application and use your position for positive change. Sincerely, Kate Hanen, Dawson Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
551	2017-02-18	Jim Drescher	Dear EAO, Please say "NO" to the proposed Aurora LNG fracked gas plant. The Skeena estuary and its salmon are more important. Respectfully, Jim Drescher Sincerely, Jim Drescher, New Germany cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
552	2017-02-18	Janice Wilson	Dear EAO, I am opposed to this project as it would have a severely negative impact on the ecology, including salmon habitat. It will also contribute to climate change as fracked gas and LNG have a huge carbon footprint. The shallow seas and narrow inlets make for significant navigation hazards. The central coast of BC is an extremely valuable global habitat that we should not ruin with this development. Sincerely, Janice Wilson, North Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
553	2017-02-18	Karoly Ban Matei	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Karoly Ban Matei, Edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
554	2017-02-18	Marilyn Belak	Dear EAO, Environmental concerns must be considered through a lens of interdependence and diversity in nature. Please prevent LNG by CNOOC on our invaluable coast and river systems. British Columbia , despite the destruction we are witnessing in the north-east with O&G and other 'resource' operations is capable of being a leader in life centered policies. All life is interdependent and humans must respect our biosphere. There is a great future for BC if we create a new economy based on cooperation instead of greed. The money for these mega projects uses our tax dollars to subsidize development and profits go to he industrialist not the people. Short term work for long term destruction can only be brought to its senses by a strong environmental ethic that considers life first. Stop Aurora LNG and all petroleum export and processing on our coast. Sincerely Marilyn Belak Sincerely, Marilyn Belak, Dawson Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
555	2017-02-18	Louise Broderick	Dear EAO, Please do not let Aurora LNG to be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island. This will destroy Skeena salmon. Don't sacrifice our natural resources for foreign companies.. We must keep our land and water pristine. Sincerely, Louise Broderick Sincerely, Louise Broderick, Red Deer cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
556	2017-02-18	Debra Gakeler	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Debra Gakeler, Overland Park cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
557	2017-02-18	Aslihan Gedik	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Aslihan Gedik, Frankfurt am Main cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
558	2017-02-18	Laura Neiman	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Laura Neiman, New York cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

559	2017-02-18	Martin Adam	Dear EAO, I am writing to you today in connection to the proposed Nexen gas plant on Digby Island. I am very disheartened to learn of this further proposed petroleum development in the Skeena's sensitive salmon habitat. I was lucky enough to live in this area at one point in my life; at the time I was overwhelmed by the sheer beauty and power of the region. There are other ways to grow an economy; as a government and as a society we should always aim to be smart, creative, and responsible to future generations. We have a treasure up there -- it should be cherished as such, and guarded for benefit of the world. Sincerely, Dr. Martin T. Adam University of Victoria Sincerely, Martin Adam, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
560	2017-02-18	Edward Ralfe	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Edward Ralfe, Fernie cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
561	2017-02-18	terry we'ss	Dear EAO, Sincerely, terry we'ss, castlegar cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment..
562	2017-02-18	Glenn Schentag	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Glenn Schentag, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
563	2017-02-18	robert zank	Dear EAO, Sincerely, robert zank, baysville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
564	2017-02-18	Lorne Szmek	Dear EAO, These huge carbon spewing projects are not needed and not wanted by the vast majority of the population in BC. Producing and burning LNG just pumps more pollution into our air and drives climate change. Canada has committed itself to cutting greenhouse gas emissions and this plant is setting a course in the opposite direction. Here's a reminder for you. Salmon are edible, LNG is not. Sincerely, Lorne Szmek, Surrey cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
565	2017-02-18	Joy Hofer	Dear EAO, It is clear it is time to develop alternative energy sources, and stop fracking now. Do not support the gas plant proposed on Digby Island. Sincerely, Joy Hofer, Parksville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
566	2017-02-18	Anna Brewer	Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Sincerely, Anna Brewer, Fountain cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
567	2017-02-18	James Mulcare	Dear EAO, Sincerely, James Mulcare, Clarkston WA USA 99403 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

568	2017-02-18	Karen Playfair	Dear EAO, I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed Aurora LNG plant being considered for Digby Island. I believe this project to be detrimental to the First Nations in the area, inconsistent with efforts to reduce climate change and bad for the surrounding environment and wildlife. I urge you to ensure this project does not proceed. Thank you for your consideration, Karen Playfair Sincerely, Karen Playfair, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
569	2017-02-18	Sandra Materi	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sandra Materi, Casper cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
570	2017-02-18	P'nina Shames	Dear EAO: I'm writing to let you know that I am opposed to the building of another fracked gas plant, as planned by Aurora LNG, near Nexen BC. First, I'm opposed to the foreign ownership of this resource processing plant. Secondly, the environmental impacts threaten migrating salmon and the human habitation in the area, specifically the community of Dodge Cove. Please consider the negative impacts of this project in your deliberations. Sincerely, P'nina Shames, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
571	2017-02-18	Karen Pidcock	Dear EAO, Just learned of a plan to build Aurora LNG fracked gas plant on an island in the Skeena estuary salmon habitat. Very bad idea, which I strongly oppose! If you really care about our salmon & are there to protect their environment, I strongly urge you to stop such plans!! Consider please, the effect on the human environment as well! Sincerely, Karen Pidcock, Kaslo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
572	2017-02-18	Nikki Elocin	Dear EAO, AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. This is not the path we want to be on. Lets be climate action leaders, not climate bedfellows! Sincerely, Nikki Elocin Sincerely, Nikki Elocin, Kamloops cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
573	2017-02-18	Cinzia Filoni	Dear EAO, it is time to stop destroy our environments simply to gain more and more! Sincerely, Cinzia Filoni, Spinea cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
574	2017-02-18	Barry Faires	Dear EAO, This Government is ignoring all the environmental dangers of the LNG industry and Kinder Morgan. Put a stop to these capitalist atrocities and save the environment and the animals of this magnificent province. Sincerely, Barry Faires, Burnaby cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
575	2017-02-18	Pamela Fitzpatrick	Dear EAO, I urge you to say NO to Aurora LNG. The impacts on our wild salmon stocks; on our birds, our porpoises, our Native communities, our water, our health, and our entire ecosystems would be irreversible. It violates international siting regulations. How can you ignore all of this? These are the priorities we must have if we are to retain our province's geographical and ecological wealth. , I implore you to turn this down. Thank you. Sincerely, Pamela Fitzpatrick, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
576	2017-02-18	Silvia Steinhilber	Dear EAO, Once yet another piece of our planet is destroyed, it will be forever, to the detriment of every living being alive today and in the future.. This project cannot proceed. BC might benefit from some immediate financial gain, but the lasting cost is far too great. Sincerely, Silvia Steinhilber, Ste Anne cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

577	2017-02-18	Claude Robert	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Claude Robert, Shefford cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
578	2017-02-18	Sarah Brooks	Dear EAO, I am writing as a Canadian constituent to urge you to reject the Aurora LNG gas plant. Up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year in the region. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. The world is at a tipping point. Please stand up for the future of our children and the planet. Reject Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Sarah Brooks, Nelson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
579	2017-02-18	Trevor Reeves	Dear EAO, We have utilized most of the world for our economic benefit. The few remaining intact parts of the natural world are crucial for the future. I do not think trading salmon habitat for LNG is a wise use. Sincerely, Trevor Reeves, Dawson Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
580	2017-02-18	Wendy Forster	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Wendy Forster, Gateshead cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
581	2017-02-18	Denise Henshaw	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Denise Henshaw, Frankford cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
582	2017-02-18	vicki pauze	Dear EAO, When we vote for someone to represent us at a government level, we expect that they will show the same concern and care for our province and all of its environment that we as residents do. But sadly, our province has forgotten its promises to safeguard our oceans, air and water. Instead, our government has chosen a path of greed and ultimately destruction. This letter is not about the toxic fracking practices and long term cost to taxpayers for abandoned wells, it is not about the pollution created at the source of LNG with methane leakage or the clear cutting of our land through rivers, parks and mountains for the pipeline - all worthy subjects but topics for another time. No, this letter is about choosing one of the the most important and sensitive ecological areas on our coast for salmon and thousands of other marine creatures for a massive, lethal LNG complex. We all know how valuable wetlands are to not only the health of the creatures who live in them , but to the well being of our whole planet. Petronias is a corporation with a record of destruction, human rights violations and total disregard for the environment but our government has seen fit to welcome them into BC with massive financial incentives and subsidies, Our government, at both the provincial and federal level, feel that money to their parties is far more important than some silly eel grass and few fish. They feel that our tourist industry and fishing industry are minor compared to a partnership with a fossil fuel industry that is no longer economically feasible. I am sure others have written to say something about the damages this LNG colossus will perpetrate - from toxic gases in the very air residents breathe, the increased tanker traffic, the destruction of the spawning areas and bird nesting sites to the fact that international industry standards state recommended distances from populated areas for both the tankers and the plant are be ignored and potential for a environmental disaster is high. My concern goes further - our government needs to stop pandering to the oil and gas industry and acknowledge that we have a human duty to stop fossil fuel expansion. This LNG plant (as well as Kinder Morgan, Woodfibre etc) all have one thing in common - they are mega foriegn owned corporations built on a dying industry that is destroying our planet. Our tax dollars are paying for them to exploit us, their profits are leaving Canada to be doled out to shareholders and multi-million dollar CEO salaries. The paltry taxes they pay come no where close to what they take from us. Our government talks about the thousands and thousands of jobs that will be created - all smoke and mirrors as there may be at most 100 jobs created. A drop in the bucket. Why not back a project that will teach future generations a trade that is clean and has a place in the world's future. And one that will not increase our province's emissions by 250,000 tons!! A wind farm, solar or tidal ene rgy or tapping into geothermal would be applauded as forward thinking and give people in prince Rupert something to be proud of. Shame on the provincial and federal Liberals for approving this dirty project in the name of greed and money. Sincerely, vicki pauze, White Rock cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
583	2017-02-18	Mark Eveleigh	Dear EAO, Stop the LNG Crazyess!!! BC is too beautiful to become another sacrificial zone for corporate greed. Corporations want this to happen...not BCers. Wake up and do what is right for British Columbians; Stop the LNG MADNESS!! Sincerely, Mark Eveleigh, Salmon Arm cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
584	2017-02-18	Wei-Quin Wong	Dear EAO, Please say no to the Aurora LNG, due to its negative environmental impact. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year, and frankly, that is unacceptable. Sincerely, Wei-Quin Wong, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.

585	2017-02-18	NORMAN CHEADLE	Dear EAO, I write as an ex-commercial fisherman who lived for many years in Prince Rupert. I am very disturbed to learn that yet another threat to the Skeena River salmon is on the horizon, in the form an LNG plant to be built beside Delusion Bay. This area provides critical habitat for the Skeena River salmon. Please do NOT allow this LNG plant to be built. Respectfully yours, Norman Cheadle Sincerely, NORMAN CHEADLE, Sudbury cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
586	2017-02-18	Brenda Melnychuk	Dear EAO, Save the salmon for future generations and food sustainability! Say no to LNG and carbon producing energy production. Brenda Melnychuk Sincerely, Brenda Melnychuk, Sorrento cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
587	2017-02-18	Kimberly Selvage	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kimberly Selvage, Ashley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
588	2017-02-18	Raffy Dotan	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Raffy Dotan, St Catharines cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
589	2017-02-18	Stephanie Hrehirchuk	Dear EAO, It is critical that we protect our wild places in nature and our irreplaceable habitats and ecosystems. Delusion Bay is one of many such important ecosystems. Any major construction in this area can render irreparable damage to these critical habitats. The Aurora LNG would deliver a fatal blow to this area. It is vital that Canada continues to protect our wild places and natural species. We were once a leader in both environmental stewardship and technological advancement. It is time to once again lead through sustainable advancement, not outmoded practices and industry. Please put the future of Canada and Canadians first by preserving and protecting Delusion Bay, its wild species, the first nations peoples who call this area home, and other natural areas like it. Thank you, Sincerely, Stephanie Hrehirchuk, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
590	2017-02-18	Alex Altosaar	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a baaaaad Idea. Please stop planning this destructive industry in it's tracks for the sake of all our relations. Sincerely, Alex Altosaar, Argenta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
591	2017-02-18	melek korel	Dear EAO, NO TO AURORA LNG! Sincerely, melek korel, istanbul cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
592	2017-02-18	diane costerton	Dear EAO, Please do not even consider damaging one of our beautiful resources ( Skeena Salmon) to enable an out of country company to profit. It is money that will leave Canada and is a short sighted venture. Please say no to Aurora LNG Sincerely, diane costerton, Heffley Creek B.C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

593	2017-02-18	David Feeny	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Say no to Aurora LNG</p> <p>Personal letters are the most effective. It's always best to write the letter in your own words. Just write from the heart, and we'll add your name at the end.</p> <p>There was a problem with your submission. Errors have been highlighted below.</p> <p>Name* First Last</p> <p>Email* Please enter a valid email address.</p> <p>City* This field is required.</p> <p>Phone</p> <p>Yes, I would like to receive information and updates from Sierra Club BC Donate Today! Help us inspire generations to defend nature and confront climate change, so families, communities and the natural world can prosper together.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Feeny, Hamilton, ON cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
594	2017-02-18	Brad Olson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Brad Olson, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
595	2017-02-18	Gion Bezzola	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Gion Bezzola, Sorrento cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
596	2017-02-18	Ian Neufelf	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I'd prefer these resources were held in Canada for future generations rather than being sold off to China, or another country. The risk to the environment and the loss of a finite resource is to great a cost.</p> <p>Please reconsider....</p> <p>Sincerely, Ian Neufelf, Regina cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
597	2017-02-18	goji Leakey	<p>Dear EAO</p> <p>Aloha, I understand you are just wanting to fill the needs of your employees and your customers, but harming the earth to do it does not help any of us, it just makes it harder to find water you can actually drink that does not have fracking gases mixed with it. The location that you have chosen is not a good location for what you would like to put there. Water is a more precious resource than gas is and it is the lifeblood of mother earth, would you please honor the water as sacred and treat it with the respect that is deserved. May your choices honor the highest good of all, including our Mother Earth/Gaia. ,</p> <p>Sincerely, goji Leakey, Prince george cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
598	2017-02-18	Trish Dundass	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please do not allow the Aurora LNG plant to be built beside Delusion Bay as this could endanger the fragile stocks of BC salmon nearby. Moreover, the infrastructure for such a LNG plant would endanger the wetlands and critical habitats of migrating birds, and other species of animals in the area. First Nations people in the area which rely on the land and water in this area would be adversely affected and their way of life would be no more. Finally, the pollution that the building and running of this LNG plant would be so harmful to Canadian air and water, it would be disgraceful to see this development in the year 2017 because we should be concentrating on green forms of energy and forgetting forever fossil fuels and carbon producing energy. Please do the right thing and stop the Aurora LNG Plant.</p> <p>Sincerely, Trish Dundass Sincerely, Trish Dundass, metcalfe cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

599	2017-02-18	Ruth Ann Darnall	<p>Dear EAO,  From what I have read, this proposed Aurora LNG is a dangerous project. for the wild salmon of the Skeena river.  I respectfully request that this LNG plant be cancelled.  Thank you for your prompt attention to this VERY important issue.  Sincerely,  Ruth Ann Darnall, Fort St John, B.C.  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
600	2017-02-18	Francois Trahan	<p>Dear EAO,  Your first and foremost concern should be the environment. Any threats to species of fish, marine and land mammals, birds and other creatures should require alternative plans for a gas plant or any industrial development.  Technology is advanced enough that an industrial facility can be built anywhere and gas transported to a safe harbour. The environment cannot be rebuilt once it's gone; industry is only temporary, our diverse world isn't.  Sincerely,  Francois Trahan, Sooke  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
601	2017-02-18	Ron Silver	<p>Dear EAO,AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE  The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.  Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.  The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>  The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.  The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.  The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.  Sincerely,  Ron Silver, Atlantic Beach  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
602	2017-02-18	margaret silver	<p>Dear EAOAURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE  The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.  Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.  The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>  The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.  The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.  The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.,  Sincerely,  margaret silver, Atlantic Beach Duval County  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

603	2017-02-18	Ramsey Fendall	Dear EAO, This letter is to urge you against building the Aurora LNG plant on Digby Island. The proximity of this plant to the Skeena estuary threatens the habitats of birds and up to a billion steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon on their way to the ocean. The plant is also less than a kilometer away from Dodge Cove, an intrusion onto long standing First Nations land. It is time for BC to ween itself from fracking projects run by overseas companies and the environmental consequences of dirty energy. Be a leader and move on to clean energy solutions that will leave a habitable earth for our children. Sincerely, Ramsey Fendall, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
604	2017-02-18	Stephen Appell	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Stephen Appell, brooklyn, ny cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
605	2017-02-18	RIC BOUCHER	Dear EAO, Endangering our rich and healthy waters, our way of life that has been sustained for millennia through the existence of our wild pacific salmon and our diverse communities with such a project as the Aurora LNG project is absolutely unconceivable and intolerable. Not only is it unsustainable, but the risks associated with this madness is simply to high for us to consider. The tourism industry, though having been hacked by the cuts on accessibility to our regions, is a growing industry for the simply fact that we still have such pristine waters, air and lands, in spite of the unsustainable forest industry. To top it all, the value of our salmon industry, brings about even more dollars in the hands of our communities than any such project would ever do. Selling ourselves to the Chinese industry is simply a non-sense. Exploiting us to the apparent great benefit of a so-called British Columbian economy is a guise rendering our people, lands and waters not only more dependent, but even more so disenfranchised finding ourselves little by little in a process of subjugation. I simply can't vouch for that. Yours truly, 'ric Boucher. Sincerely, 'RIC BOUCHER, QUEEN CHARLOTTE cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
606	2017-02-18	rose moore	Dear EAO, Sincerely, rose moore, Yale St. Clair County cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
607	2017-02-18	Susan Babbitt	Dear EAO, For the sake of wildlife, including birds, porpoise, and salmon, for the sake of human health, and to avoid greenhouse gas emission. Please do not proceed with Aurora LNG. Sincerely, Susan Babbitt, Philadelphia cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
608	2017-02-18	Mike Trussler	Dear EAO, I urge all B.C. politicians to support environmental policies: in the long run, this support will prove to be the wisest both in economic and ecological terms. Canada, and B.C. particularly, can demonstrate to the world how enlightened policy makers can function. We need to lead in climate change policy especially. Foreign oil companies won't have to pay for long-standing damage to the local environment. Sincerely, Mike Trussler, Regina cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
609	2017-02-18	Linda May	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Linda May, Apex cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.



610	2017-02-18	Richard Elzby	<p>Dear EAO,  <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE!!!!</b>  As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>It would seem that we are in a race to see what and who can pollute our environment without any consideration for us, the Canadian citizens who put you where you are today. To say the least you're doing what you want and not what you're constituents want. So please say no to this foreign national corporation. It's the only sane answer!</p> <p>Thank you.  Sincerely,  Richard Elzby, Meaford  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
611	2017-02-18	Janis Hug	<p>Dear EAO,  <b>JUST SAY NO TO AURORA LNG!!!!</b>  <b>REMEMBER WHO YOU WORK FOR AND WE WILL BE WATCHING YOU!!!</b>  Sincerely,  Janis Hug, Santa Rosa  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
612	2017-02-18	Graham Mulligan	<p>Graham  Sincerely,  Graham Mulligan, Surrey  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
613	2017-02-18	Susan Stout	<p>Dear EAO,  The ecosystem is too fragile to withstand more fracking. The world must get away from its dependence on carbon!  Stop LNG and all threats to Skeena salmon and our food supply.  Sincerely,  Susan Stout, North Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
614	2017-02-18	Gill Hyland	<p>Dear EAO,  How can you consider this location that has such a vital human, fisheries and wildlife habitat. not to mention the fragility of the environment. You will destroy more than you will gain and in the process poison the land and air. Please reconsider.  Sincerely,  Gill Hyland, Perth  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
615	2017-02-18	Karen Mclvor	<p>Dear EAO,  I strongly oppose the building of the Aurora LNG fracking plant proposed by Nexen. It will damage critical habitat for fish and birds, it will threaten community health and safety in the nearby First Nations. It will produce tonnes of greenhouse gases, both in BC and in Asia.  Let's be honest. We need to invest in new technologies: wind, solar and tidal. There are already more people working in these areas in BC than in oil and gas, so it's not jobs that are the problem. It's profits.  Sincerely,  Karen Mclvor, Victoria  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern..</p>
616	2017-02-18	Andrew Lees	<p>Dear EAO,  Please protect the Skeena Salmon and deny this latest proposal from Nexen. We need our wild salmon, we do not need LNG!  Sincerely,  Andrew Lees, Victoria  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
617	2017-02-18	As Re	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  As Re, Wayne  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
618	2017-02-18	Kathy Scalzo	<p>Dear EAO,  Please stop the proposed Aurora LNG plant from becoming a reality. Our planet needs responsible leaders to take a stand and protect the wildlife and physical health of this area.  Your actions matter.  Sincerely,  Kathy Scalzo, Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

619	2017-02-18	Michelle Hayward	<p>Dear EAO,  Putting salmon at risk endangers the livelihoods and food resources of humans and animals.  A catastrophic event could irrevocably alter the local environment whilst its general use would spew out more carbon; changing the local environment irreversibly at a time when we urgently need to invest in green energy.  As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must also obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.  Everything about the Aurora LNG project is what we should be moving away from as a society; dirty and foreign owned fuel.  Please do not approve this project.  Yours sincerely  Michelle Hayward  Sincerely,  Michelle Hayward, Kempston  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
620	2017-02-18	Virginia McCoy	<p>Dear EAO, this is ridiculous. Will you oil giants never be happy and satisfied until you ruin every beautiful place on the earth. Forget this horrible idea. Animals, water and land are more important than disgusting oil death and pollution. Leave this land alone.  Sincerely,  Virginia McCoy, Mimbres  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
621	2017-02-18	Norlan Cabot	<p>Dear EAO,  Why am I writing this letter?  Have you read the stats of global warming?  And yet we proceed as if there is limitless time to turn our thinking around about abusing our planet.  I say NO to millions of tons of more emissions into the atmosphere.  Sincerely,  Norlan Cabot, Vancouver  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
622	2017-02-18	Dominique Lebrun	<p>Dear EAO,  We do not need fracking, we do not want fracking!  Go green!  Dominique Lebrun  Sincerely,  Dominique Lebrun, Wells  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
623	2017-02-18	Roberta Williams	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Roberta Williams, Squamish, BC  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
624	2017-02-18	Wendy Hill	<p>Dear EAO,  It seems you and your ilk are determined to destroy our province. Look at the USA where they are having huge problems with the fracked water, sink holes and earthquakes caused by fracking. STOP before it's too late!  Wendy Hill  Sincerely,  Wendy Hill, Port Alberni  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
625	2017-02-18	Stephan Donovan	<p>Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  Stephan Donovan, Chicago  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
626	2017-02-18	Lee Fister	<p>Dear EAO,  Save all of nature in the name of Jesus! it's here for us to enjoy not to kill off so don't kill but let live!!  Sincerely,  Lee Fister, Allentown  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
627	2017-02-18	Sam Duncombe	<p>Dear EAO,  Please say NO to Aurora LNG  These plants threaten the community, the wildlife and the environment.  In 2017 isn't it time the world switch to renewable energy for power?  When does this madness stop? After we've polluted every stream, river and ocean?  Isn't it time we harness the free natural energy we have? What do we tell our children when we've obliterated their future?  Please SAY NO TO LNG and look at other sustainable ways to power the Planet.  Sincerely,  Sincerely,  Sam Duncombe, Nassau  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

628	2017-02-18	John Mark Robertson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to urge you not to allow the Aurora LNG plant to be built. Among a host of other problems, this plant would create 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year. We can't claim to be serious about fighting climate change while at the same time approving hugely destructive projects like this. BC has legislated climate targets. Allowing this project will show clearly that the government is not serious about these targets.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, John Mark Robertson, Belleville</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
629	2017-02-18	cathy elizabeth levin	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b></p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, cathy elizabeth levin, Bayonne, NJ</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
630	2017-02-18	Heather Cross	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Heather Cross, brooklyn</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
631	2017-02-18	doug krause	<p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, doug krause, winnipeg</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
632	2017-02-18	Sean Vanderluit	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please reject this project as it poses a great risk to northern communities and populations of salmon on which their livelihood depends! British Columbia needs to move towards developing industries that are less impactful on biodiversity, the climate and small communities! As a British Columbian youth I implore the EAO and premier to block further advancement of the Aurora LNG project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sean Vanderluit, Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
633	2017-02-18	marg sutton	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>BC's salmon populations are already hurting. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs.</p> <p>Sincerely, marg sutton, Gabriola Island</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

634	2017-02-18	Susan Schellenberg	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Susan Schellenberg, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
635	2017-02-18	suzanne o'meara	Dear EAO, Sincerely, suzanne o'meara, cape town cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
636	2017-02-18	Maureen Doram	Dear EAO, I am opposed to the development of Aurora LNG because it will threaten the welfare of salmon, birds and other wildlife on Digby Island. Fracking causes wide spread pollution and destroys wetlands that have taken thousands of years to establish . Please do not allow the Aurora LNG to proceed. Sincerely Maureen Doram Sincerely, Maureen Doram, Edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
637	2017-02-18	Jean Turner	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Jean Turner, Williams Lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
638	2017-02-18	Evelyn Hunter	Dear EAO, Humans need nature way more than nature needs humans. As the wild ones go so will we. There are so many assaults on our oceans and land we can not afford to let a dying industry continue to ruin what sustains us. Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Aurora LNG threatens our climate As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Evelyn Hunter, Youbou cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
639	2017-02-18	Elizabeth Abrantes	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Elizabeth Abrantes, Cambridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
640	2017-02-18	Brian Flavin	Dear EAO, This type of short-term gain, a period of one decade or two, has done so much damage to the world. No sane person who cares for the future of our children cold let it go ahead. Please, be one of the few people in charge who thinks about the long term. Fracked gas is a flash in the pan, but the consequences could last a generation or two. Thank you for listening. Sincerely, Brian Flavin, Cork, Ireland. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

641	2017-02-18	Kent Robinson	<p>Dear EAO, I've been fishing the skeena my whole life. And my dad has fished the skeena his whole life. Along with many of my other friends and family members. I very much so look forward to heading to the river each spring when the runs come in and it would break my heart to know that there would be approval for this fracked gas plant knowing that it will have such a major impact on the wildlife and the environment. I'm writing on behalf of everyone here in Burns Lake, BC. Say no to LNG!</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Beautiful British Columbia Kent Robinson. Sincerely, Kent Robinson, Burns lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
642	2017-02-18	Brian Gingras	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I have vacationed in British Columbia several times and find it the most beautiful place I have ever seen. Consequently, I am concerned about it's future because of Aurora LNG. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brian Gingras, Braintree cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
643	2017-02-18	Dianne Douglas	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Dianne Douglas, Phoenix cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
644	2017-02-18	Astrid Bradbury	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Astrid Bradbury, Roxboro cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
645	2017-02-18	Seth Levinson	<p>Dear EAO, B.C. can't afford to put another nail in the coffin of the natural world. And that's what the Aurora LNG plant will do. It's time to zoom out and see the big picture: generating money or jobs and resource extraction should never be favoured over safeguarding a world that we can all inhabit safely and sustainably. These salmon are a link in an monumental chain of relationships. We may think that taking one little link out won't hurt anyone. As study after study has indicated, that reasoning is incorrect. If we don't honour the natural world it is to our peril that coffin is the very same one we'll all have to crawl into. Please take the big view.</p> <p>Sincerely, Seth Levinson, East Lawrencetown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
646	2017-02-18	Maurice Costa	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Maurice Costa, Neupr' cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
647	2017-02-18	Robert Brown	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I do not want to see the Aurora LNG facility built. One reason is that it is too close to the Skeena estuary, a home to millions of young salmon passing by between their homes in the river and the ocean. Another is that it is run by the Chinese, whose home-state pollution is so bad that they would have to be heavily regulated to ensure high quality air in the region. A third is that by building this LNG facility, you would be risking the environment to additional carbon pollution, which would bring global warming problems even further along rather than starting to tame them.</p> <p>It is a bad idea to built this plant. Stop it now.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Brown, Fircrest, WA cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

648	2017-02-18	Tim Barrington	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to voice opposition to the proposed Aurora LNG gas plant to be constructed near Prince Rupert on Digby Island. It is much too close to the Skeena estuary where salmon make their way to the ocean every year.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration on this issue.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Tim Barrington  Sincerely,  Tim Barrington, San Jose  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
649	2017-02-18	aron shevis	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Nexen is proposing to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat. Salmon populations are already in trouble and this project would devastate their habitat. We need to give them a fighting chance by protecting intact habitat and shifting from fossil fuel projects to good green jobs. This gas plant is not the answer</p> <p>Sincerely,  aron shevis, brooklyn  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
650	2017-02-18	John Brewer	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please say no to Aurora LNG!</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>This proposed plant should not be built because of the concerns listed above.</p> <p>Thank you  Sincerely,  John Brewer, Montreal  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
651	2017-02-18	S Johnson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Fracked gas is as bad for the environment as oil. From the process in which literally millions of litres of fresh water are wasted, to getting it to market. Where it costs more to get out of the ground than you can make on it.</p> <p>Don't you understand? There is only a finite amount of water in the world. And the same amount. It doesn't come from outer space or our atmosphere. We only have what we have. Whether it's in the air as particles or as rain or snow or rivers or aquifers. It goes up and it comes back down but it's always the same quantity in our world.</p> <p>When you take that fresh water out of the ecosystem, it's gone. It can never be used for anything again. At least with ocean water we have the technology to build desalinization plants. Israel has been using these successfully for years. With fracking water it's not good for anything anymore.</p> <p>Proponents of natural gas are either blind, ignorant, greedy or uneducated. Do your research. Don't allow this plant to be built. You can't eat or drink or breathe money. Just for once, put the money aside and do the right thing for our world.</p> <p>Sincerely,  S Johnson, Delta  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
652	2017-02-18	Jennifer Stewart	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>We do not want an LNG plant in the purposed area. We do not want fracking period. Our ocean habitat is to vital to us.</p> <p>Please do not go forward with this plant. My culture and its livelihood depend on it.</p> <p>Thank you  Sincerely,  Jennifer Stewart, New Westminster  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
653	2017-02-18	Annie Lachance	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,  Annie Lachance, Stoneham  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

654	2017-02-18	Marie Elaina Rago	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marie Elaina Rago, Northampton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
655	2017-02-18	Danielle Pirotte	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Danielle Pirotte, Neupr' cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
656	2017-02-18	Don Devine	Dear EAO, The proposed Aurora LNG plant is too great a risk to water, air, people and and salmon populations. It must not be built. Further, as a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. This is a bad idea. Please consider the costs and the burdens to so many for the benefit of a few powerful interests. Sincerely, Don Devine, Chester cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
657	2017-02-18	Kirk Rhoads	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kirk Rhoads, Mountain Home cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
658	2017-02-18	tom harris	Dear EAO, Sincerely, tom harris, bordentown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
659	2017-02-18	Bob Stuart	Dear EAO, I left the coast because there were too few salmon already. A fish farm hatchery polluted my well. Sincerely, Bob Stuart, Spiritwood cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
660	2017-02-18	Rod Dunnett	Dear EAO, I say NO to Aurora LNG. Every year our pristine Canadian environment is under attack, and piece by piece it is sliced off for industrial use. As a person who grew up in a heavily industrialized town in Britain, and saw the value of an unpolluted environment, I see the inherent value in wild spaces and species that are worth far far more than the dollar. I say listen to the local people whose lives will be irrevocably changed, and say no to this development. Sincerely, Rod Dunnett, Kaslo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
661	2017-02-18	maurice trempe	Dear EAO, Sincerely, maurice trempe, sherbrooke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
662	2017-02-18	dan cappello	Dear EAO, Sincerely, dan cappello, lawrence cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
663	2017-02-18	suzanne audet	Dear EAO, Sincerely, suzanne audet, sherbrooke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
664	2017-02-18	Lisbeth Mousseau	Dear EAO, Please leave something for our grandchildren to destroy! I think we did our share so far. Do not approve Aurora LNG Sincerely, Lisbeth Mousseau, Ottawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
665	2017-02-18	terri azevedo	Dear EAO, Sincerely, terri azevedo, oshawa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
666	2017-02-18	kathy haverkamp	Dear EAO, Fracking is dangerous to the environment, please work to insure the safety of our waters! Sincerely, kathy haverkamp, geneva cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

667	2017-02-18	Alison Hartley	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Alison Hartley, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
668	2017-02-18	William Lee Kohler	Dear EAO, Sincerely, William Lee Kohler, Eugene cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
669	2017-02-18	Louise Kane	Dear EAO, No No No to this gas fracking plant. Sincerely, Louise Kane, Eastham cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
670	2017-02-18	Frank Florio	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Frank Florio, Niagara Falls cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
671	2017-02-18	Carl Lemelin	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Carl Lemelin, Lachine cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
672	2017-02-18	John Scott	Dear EAO, Sincerely, John Scott, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
673	2017-02-18	Judi Oswald	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Judi Oswald, Indian Harbour Beach cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
674	2017-02-18	Sandra BIGNELL	Dear EAO, This proposal is madness. I have read the main part of this letter and so don't want to repeat. As I say, this is criminal and crazy. Not only will you be devastating the fish population, which I believe to be criminal, you will be killing the human population in the area. this has already happened in other areas in Canada, where big businesses have not cared that people are dying of pollution in their land. Please do NOT let this go ahead, for everyone's sake. Come on! Step up to the plate, and stop this madness. Sandra Bignell Sincerely, Sandra BIGNELL, Winnipeg cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
675	2017-02-18	Chris Drumright	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Chris Drumright, Murfreesboro, TN cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
676	2017-02-18	Mark Hutchinson	Dear EAO, I have become so sick and tired of reading about yet another company that puts its profits before the people and environment that will be affected by its existence and insatiable search for yet more profits. Eventually, you will be stopped. At some point in time you will cease to have any say over decisions that affect the lives and the environment that will suffer as a result of those decisions. I guess as long as its not in your back yard it must be OK? I'm sure your children and grandchildren will thank you for the world you've created for them. Sincerely, Mark Hutchinson, Gibsons cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
677	2017-02-18	karen kalmenson	Dear EAO, Sincerely, karen kalmenson, Great Neck cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
678	2017-02-18	William Klock	Dear EAO, Sincerely, William Klock, Watauga cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.



679	2017-02-19	Yo pere	Dear EAO, Sincerely, yo pere, beaucaire cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
680	2017-02-19	Colin Punched	Dear EAO, with Fraser river salmon returns dwindling, it's important to protect the 2nd greatest salmon run in Canada - the Skeena. The proposed Aurora LNG facility poses risks to this ecosystem that are too great. Please look at the long term pros and cons and make the right decision. Thanks, -Colin Punched Sincerely, Colin Punched, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
681	2017-02-19	Michelle Pedersen	Dear EAO, So let's call it what it really is...liquified fracked gas. I implore you to not do this to the already threatened food source for all human beings. Salmon. Do you like eating salmon? Would you like your grandchildren to taste wild salmon? The excessive greed that comes with the fossil fuel industry is galling. Develop something else. I'm sure you have the money and skills to do so. MLP Sincerely, Michelle Pedersen, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
682	2017-02-19	Alicia Brooks	Dear EAO, Please do not approve the aurora lng plant. This plant will help destroy the skeena salmon, and contribute to our enormous carbon footprint by adding 6.7billion tonnes of carbon each year. Please I am begging you to please reject this project. It is bad news for our pristine environment and our climate. Let's leave s beautiful natural gegacy for our children to inheirit, instead of making Chinese corporations richer. Sincerely , Alicia Brooks Nakusp, B.C Sincerely, Alicia Brooks, Nakusp cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
683	2017-02-19	Heidi Ludwick	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Heidi Ludwick, Papillion cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
684	2017-02-19	Linda Vickaryous	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Linda Vickaryous, Delta cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
685	2017-02-19	Mureena Roberts	Dear EAO, Please closely consider the effects of a project like this on an already suffering resource, Pacific Salmon. I know there are many people who are very concerned with the creation of good paying jobs, but this is a cost too great, and a loss of fisheries jobs, as well. Sincerely, Mureena Roberts, Kamloops cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
686	2017-02-19	Katherine Babiak	Dear EAO, Up to a billion young salmon migrate to the ocean every year in the Skeena estuary. Aurora LNG would be built by a Chinese oil giant near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of this estuary.. This is an extremely sensitive area, providing critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon in addition to being the location of ancient muskeg wetlands, an important area for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. This is a bad idea on so many fronts. Sincerely, Katherine Babiak, Port Tobacco cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
687	2017-02-19	Petra Jones	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Petra Jones, Sydney cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

688	2017-02-19	Joanne Peterson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am dismayed that Digby Island, an important migrating bird sanctuary, is being considered as a site for a liquid natural gas plant. In addition, the salmon habitat of nearby Delusion Bay would be adversely affected by such a project.</p> <p>Besides the negative impact to wildlife, the proposed Aurora LNG plant would degrade the quality of life for nearby residents of Dodge Cove.</p> <p>It would also contravene the right of the area's First Nations people to free, prior and informed consent for industrial projects in their traditional territory.</p> <p>It is also clearly incompatible with the necessary transition to cleaner energy.</p> <p>Why should a Chinese oil company be allowed to trash this beautiful area of Canada? Any short-term economic benefits to Canadians are far outweighed by the negative consequences.</p> <p>Please say NO to the Aurora LNG plant.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joanne Peterson, Stony Plain cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
689	2017-02-19	Harvey Armstrong	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I've been concerned for some time about the fate of our wild salmon in BC. Certainly the fish farms along the coast are threat to the wild stocks due to viral infections and sea lice.</p> <p>There's no question that the government's push for LNG before anything else will not bode well for our salmon. Siting the Aurora LNG plant by Delusion Bay will constitute as great a threat to salmon as the proposed Petronas plant on Lelu island.</p> <p>First Nations rely on this area for fishing and food harvesting. But the most significant result of these LNG plants is the huge amount of greenhouse gases that will be produced.</p> <p>Please vote to either end this project completely, or failing that, site these plants in less ecologically sensitive areas.</p> <p>Sincerely, Harvey Armstrong, Kaslo BC V0G1M0 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
690	2017-02-19	Jane Gilley	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Jane Gilley, Austin cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
691	2017-02-19	Bill Darnell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>It is obvious to many people, backed by research such as The Sky's Limit report that we have to stop expanding our fossil fuel infrastructure now and start a managed decline in the production and use of fossil fuels in the next 15 years if we want to have a chance of keeping the warming of the atmosphere below 2 degrees. There is not room for Aurora LNG in a livable future.</p> <p>Don't do it.</p> <p>Bill Darnell Sincerely, Bill Darnell, Vernon cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
692	2017-02-19	Judith Stevenson	<p>Dear BC Environmental Assessors:</p> <p>As someone who was born and bred on the coast of BC, and whose father was a fisheries biologist who worked his whole life for DFO, I grew up respecting salmon and fully aware of their importance to First Nations, the commercial fisheries as well as the fly fishermen (and women). Permitting a fracked gas plant to be built on Digby Island near the mouth of the legendary Skeena River -- one of the best producers of salmon anywhere on the coast -- is not just foolish and dangerous, it is unthinkable because of all that it would put at risk. Not just the economic security of coastal fishers (native and non-native) would be at risk -- but complex marine and wetland ecosystems that are essential for many species of birds and marine creatures. Threats to these species and to the health and safety as well as peace and quiet of the people living in nearby communities -- so much so that I believe over 90% are opposed to it, an amazing majority. But those reasons to say no, compelling as they are, pale in comparison to the biggest threat posed by this proposed plant: the increase in GHGs that it would be responsible for.: 6.7 million tons per year! Now we are talking about the future of life on earth. For your children and your children's children, if for no other reason, say NO to the Aurora LNG plant -- please.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Stevenson, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
693	2017-02-19	Daniel Lantela	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Daniel Lantela, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
694	2017-02-19	David Kirkby	<p>Dear EAO, the future of food a sources and the diversity of wild life is way more important than the removal of fossil fuels.</p> <p>We need to chart a course that reduces dependency on fossil fuels.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Kirkby, New Westminster cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
695	2017-02-19	Gregory Rouse	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Gregory Rouse, Cambridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

696	2017-02-19	DEBORAH SMITH	<p>.Dear EAO, I AM AGAINST THIS!!!!!! Nexen is proposing to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas. Right now, The BC Environmental Assessment Office is asking for input on the project. The public comment period will close very soon. We need your help to flood the EAO with letters telling them this salmon-killing carbon bomb does not belong, Sincerely, DEBORAH SMITH Sincerely, DEBORAH SMITH, OKLAHOMA CITY cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
697	2017-02-19	Tomas Ersson	<p>Dear EAO, BC and its beautiful coastline does not need the Aurora LNG fracked gas plant. And the salmon of the Skeena River certainly doesn't either. Please stop the plans for the Digby Island LNG plant! Sincerely, Tomas Ersson, High River, AB cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
698	2017-02-19	Christiane Schmidt	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Christiane Schmidt, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
699	2017-02-19	Darren Gregory	<p>Dear EAO: First of all, let me acknowledge Sierra Club BC for provision of the body of this text. Upon review of this position, I stand with Sierra Club BC on this issue. I'm informed that: "Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC." Further: "It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone.: Of great concern for me: "The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas." With other projects already approved, with potential loss of habitat relative to Site-C, and with already seeing other Fracked-Gas, LNG projects approved: "Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern." In an era of witnessing advances in technology that can generate true, clean-energy and job generating solutions for British Columbians, and given our commitments in regards to Climate Change in Paris last year as Canadians: "The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project." Additionally: "The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms.: :This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved." In spite of promises for fast-response to any accidents relative to shipping along the BC Coast, the recent incident with a tug sinking near Bella-Bella accents the reality of just how currently unprepared we are for such accidents. Any accident involving fuel spillage in the area relative to this and other such projects is reported to be, potentially, 'catastrophic'. This proposed project is the largest one under consideration to date: "As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
700	2017-02-19	Mary Jo Brinker	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Mary Jo Brinker, Ellwood City cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

701	2017-02-19	Kevin Proctor	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I would like to write a letter of support to the Aurora LNG Terminal on Digby Island.</p> <p>As an actual resident of the area I know the location of the proposed plant very well and I have always said, as have many first nations who have done work in the area have said, that Digby island is without a doubt the best place to put the terminal for the least environmental impact.</p> <p>An article written by the Sierra Club is spreading tons of false information about the dangers if the sea over there. They are claiming that the ships would have to enter prince rupert harbour which apparently is a dangerous and hostile environment for ships. That is not true at all, it would be on the west side of Digby island which is basically open Ocean over there.</p> <p>They also claim it's going to destroy the fishing grounds of the Metlakatla and Kitkatla tribes, well all I have to say to that is that Metlakatla has already approved Petronas and Kitkatla is nowhere near the proposed site so I find their claims to the area to be quite ridiculous.</p> <p>This terminal would bring much needed jobs and money into the Prince Rupert area which could in turn be used to fund more environmental research, green energy or environmental restoration efforts. Wouldn't it be wonderful if Prince Rupert had a wastewater treatment plant so then we aren't dumping raw sewage into the ocean surrounding the town. With some actual economic development in the town that could be a real possibility.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kevin Proctor, Port Edward cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
702	2017-02-19	Joelle Thurston	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my concerns about the Aurora LNG project.</p> <p>The project threatens salmon and other wildlife; community health and safety; and our climate.</p> <p>If the health of our environment, which directly impacts our well-being, isn't enough, then please consider the rights of affected First Nations, who have not consented to the project.</p> <p>Please do the right thing. We're all counting on you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joelle Thurston, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
703	2017-02-19	Craig Tobin	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Craig Tobin, Port Coquitlam cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
704	2017-02-19	Prudence Moore	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed fracked gas plant by the Chinese oil giant CNOOC. We cannot put our precious natural environment and resources at risk for foreign nationals to exploit what we have.</p> <p>At this critical moment in history, we need to stop the development of fossil fuels and invest in non carbon producing renewables. If we can send people to the moon we can develop adequate non carbon power strategies.</p> <p>We must put our money and mental capacities to work to build a clean and sustainable future.</p> <p>Sincerely, Prudence Moore, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
705	2017-02-19	Kevin Bonell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>please stop the development of Digby Island it is too risky to our indigenous salmon populations and the mighty Skeena Steelhead</p> <p>Sincerely, Kevin Bonell, Kamloops BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

706	2017-02-19	Erinn Todd	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am very concerned about the proposed plan for the Aurora LNG plant to be built on Digby Island for several reasons.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.</p> <p>The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b></p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Please make the right choice and stop this plan. Put the public and environmental good first, and not lining the pockets of big corporations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Erinn Todd, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
707	2017-02-19	Katherine Serrano	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I do not support the construction of the Aurora LNG gas plant on Digby Island.</p> <p>As a civilization in 2017, first of all we need to be investing in non-fossil fuel forms of energy, and the construction of a new LNG plant is the way of thinking of an old world, not the kind of investment we need now, in the new world, trying to meet our climate targets.</p> <p>Additionally, this location is just north of the Skeena estuary, beside a critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon. We must protect our natural resources, and the traditional fishing and harvesting areas of the Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Nation.</p> <p>Thank you, Sincerely, Katherine Serrano, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
708	2017-02-19	david berofe	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Fracking and the environment do not mix!</p> <p>It is time that the concerns of First Nations actually come first! Do not approve this plant.</p> <p>Sincerely, david berofe, elgin cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
709	2017-02-19	Bonnie Brandt	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This plant is harmful. You must say no. Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bonnie Brandt, Field cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
710	2017-02-19	Marly Wexler	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Building this plant, would be a disaster for the water, air, people and animals who inhabit this place.</p> <p>Please, don't do it</p> <p>Sincerely, Marly Wexler, San Deigo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

711	2017-02-19	Greg Boyd	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Greg Boyd, Woodbridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
712	2017-02-19	Lisa-Marie Serafin	Dear EAO, The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Sincerely, Lisa-Marie Serafin, Mayo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
713	2017-02-19	Bert Brown	Dear EAO, Just a short note to ask why you want to destroy our natural salmon habitat near Prince Rupert BC you have no business putting one so close to all our salmon grounds in the north we're just starting to get back our runs of salmon I know if you do this you'll destroy everything that was invested to get our stocks back not to mention all the wild life that use those waters alot of livelihoods depend on those stocks for work and food for all the first Nations who live all over the north there think long and hard about everything your going to destroy shame in you all of you Sincerely, Bert Brown, Bella Bella Bc Box 38 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
714	2017-02-19	Nancy Neumann	Dear EAO, As a supporter of Sierra Club, I agree with their following arguments: The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Sincerely, Nancy Neumann, GERMANY cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.

715	2017-02-19	Nancy Neznabb	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>As a supporter of the Sierra Club, I'm in total agreement with their arguments against this project:</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nancy Neznabb, Germany cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
716	2017-02-19	Chris PRUVOT	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>As a BC resident, I say NO to the Aurora LNG!</p> <p>It's wrong and you know it! What's happened to honourable leadership! I really expect better of Canadian policy.</p> <p>This is a shameful project and it won't happen. People do NOT want it!</p> <p>It's as if the civilized world has gone completely mad!</p> <p>Sincerely, Chris PRUVOT, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
717	2017-02-20	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I have several concerns with the proposed project. The proponent has taken a very low profile approach with the project and there has been little to no discussion or education in the local media at a level the general public can understand. While they have a long list of supposed consultation, the general public is generally unaware of the project. This has come about from environmental assessment fatigue as Prince Rupert has been the epicenter of assessments. There have been more projects with endless binders of incomprehensible information than a person can manage.</p> <p>Secondly, I was told at the open house that apart from one tiny little spot at fairview on occasion, air emission issues will not be a problem. It doesn't matter that you produced a 300 page document that only an air quality technician can read, but it stands to reason that burning 25 million tonnes of LNG downwind of our community cannot occur without a major impact to human health.</p> <p>Third, while we are being asked to live with the impacts and risks, there has been nothing provided about how the project will benefit the community directly. A few indirect jobs etc, but you are not going to pay municipal taxes and rebuild this town.</p> <p>It is also a joke how you engage with the Dodge Cove residents and pretend you can mitigate the problems. You should just be upfront and admit you will destroy the place so why don't you just offer them a big fat buyout?</p> <p>I have little confidence that this project will benefit the community.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Our vision is to deliver clean-burning natural gas from our shale gas assets in northeast BC to growing Asia-Pacific markets. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
718	2017-02-20	Personal Information Withheld - New Hazelton, British Columbia	<p>I am opposed to the the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project. The project will bring temporary jobs to the area but will not provide long-term job security.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
719	2017-02-20	Robert Brent Patriquin - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Aurora LNG is proposing to build their facility on Digby Island at the mouth of the harbour to Prince Rupert. Some of the information I have read mandates exclusion zones around such facilities and these are clearly being neglected. With industrialization and the global security threat Prince Rupert Harbour is becoming more difficult to access recreationally, be it on shore or water. Our life style is being severely impacted and will be much more so if this plan goes through.</p> <p>As one last reflection, Digby Island is the site of Prince Rupert's only airport. The runway runs approximately north- south, putting the proposed LNG site, on the south end of the island, just east of the flight path for aircraft.....! wonder? in the planning stages of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant were there any voices questioning the wisdom of this site, at sea level, in an active earthquake zone. Let's learn from the past, not repeat it.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
720	2017-02-20	Elaine Fischer	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Salmon and unspoiled wilderness are more important tot he region then Fossil Fuels!</p> <p>Sincerely, Elaine Fischer, Roanoke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

721	2017-02-20	Denise Dufault	Dear EAO, Don't wreck Our Salmon habitat. Invest in Green Energy alternatives, If you love this planet! Sincerely, Denise Dufault, Slocan cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
722	2017-02-20	Les Watkins	Dear EAO, Save our wild salmon And our coast Sincerely, Les Watkins, Maple ridge cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
723	2017-02-20	Sue Hayden	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG would be hugely destructive blight on our planet and directly impact Skeena salmon and numerous plant and animal species and the cleanliness of the water. When are we as a species going to say NO to fracking? It is something only greedy, short-sighted people believe in who do not care about the future of the planet or of their children! Sincerely, Sue Hayden, Palm Harbor cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
724	2017-02-20	Tricia Wands	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Tricia Wands, Kitchener cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
725	2017-02-20	Francy Elkins	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Francy Elkins, Williams Lake cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
726	2017-02-20	Stephanie Sweeney	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Stephanie Sweeney, Quebec cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
727	2017-02-20	Michele Mercer	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Michele Mercer, Casa Grande cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
728	2017-02-20	Twyla Kline	Dear EAO, Salmon are one of the most significant creatures on the planet!! Salmon populations affect our locale economics and world wide economics. At the same time, they are significant for so many species survival as well as our own. Please stop this development. Sincerely, Twyla Kline, Chilliwack cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
729	2017-02-20	Chris Thompson	Dear EAO, Let's stop destroying our wild salmon runs. Reading 'Heart of the Raincoast' by Billy Proctor, one realizes how we are destroying critical habitat. And for what? 20 more years of gas and oil when we will all be on solar derivative energy by 2040. Sincerely, Chris Thompson Sincerely, Chris Thompson, Lions Bay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
730	2017-02-20	Aubrey Guilbault	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Aubrey Guilbault, Grand Blanc cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
731	2017-02-20	judi schulz	Dear EAO, I think this proposed fracked gas plant is totally wrong headed. In an age when we have made so much progress with other non- polluting or less harmful forms of energy to continue with clearly and well documented harmful energy plans is shameful to say the least. Please reconsider. Sincerely, Sincerely, judi schulz, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.



732	2017-02-20	Jan Bertelsen-James	<p>Dear EAurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife</p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.</p> <p>The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.AO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Jan Bertelsen-James, Eureka cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
733	2017-02-20	Siddharth Mehrotra	<p>Dear EAO:</p> <p>Given the present environmental difficulties (pollution, political corruption, exhaustion of resources, and the spread of disease, et al.), it becomes imperative to prevent the construction of fossil-fuel infrastructure around the world; in example whereof, we the undersigned recommend the prevention of the Aurora Liquefied Natural Gas plant on Digby Island, and the cessation, over the next three years, of all mining of this substance, until the level of environmental pollution is sufficiently lower, and that of technology higher, to permit its use.</p> <p>Sincerely, Siddharth Mehrotra, Camarillo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
734	2017-02-20	Susann Easson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please stop the proposed Aurora LNG massive gas plant being proposed by Nexen.</p> <p>This area encompasses critical salmon habitat which must be protected at all costs The wild salmon &amp; the coastal communities should be the first priority in this decision. Salmon are already struggling in many areas &amp; need protection now.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susann Easson, Stoney Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
735	2017-02-20	Earl Richards	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>There is something fishy going on here. Why did Nexen and Clark select a site next to a salmon spawning area?</p> <p>Sincerely, Earl Richards, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
736	2017-02-20	JAKE HODIE	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please say NO to Aurora LNG!!!</p> <p>So many of our waters have already been ruined by development, drilling, pollution, and humans.</p> <p>Enough is enough!</p> <p>Our waters are supposed to be a place of peace and quiet for us, and the fish and wildlife which live in them!</p> <p>The animals are running out of places to live and be safe. Our fish and wildlife are under threat from so many angles. They desperately need to be protected, mainly from humans.</p> <p>Life is hard enough for people, let alone the animals.</p> <p>Can't we please offer them some much needed help?!</p> <p>PLEASE save the waters for all future generations before they are permanently ruined. Some damage cannot be undone!</p> <p>As other countries have proven time and time again that they don't care about protecting the ocean's creatures, the Canada can and must take the lead in saving them.</p> <p>We cannot afford to wait and must make sure that the fish and marine animals are protected from man-made harm. So many species are under threat and if nothing is done they could become extinct. Humans cause much of the damage, and so we must help to fix things.</p> <p>Please remember....Extinction is forever!!</p> <p>Please say NO to Aurora LNG!!!</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Jake Hodie, Toronto Sincerely, JAKE HODIE, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

737	2017-02-20	Roxanne Williams	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Roxanne Williams, Clearwater cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susann Easson, Stoney Creek cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
738	2017-02-20	Christina Crosby	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Christina Crosby, Melbourne cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
739	2017-02-20	Nancy Chismar	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Nancy Chismar, Edison cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
740	2017-02-20	sanja lalic	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, sanja lalic, zagreb cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
741 (1 of 5)	2017-02-22	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>"Potentially catastrophic pool fires or vapor cloud fires could arise from a serious accident or attack on LNG infrastructure. Proposed LNG terminals will directly impact the safety of communities...serious (safety) hazards remain since LNG is inherently volatile and is usually shipped and stored in large quantities....</p> <p>Pool Fires. If LNG spills near an ignition source, the evaporating gas in a combustible gas-air concentration will burn above the LNG pool.<sup>8</sup> The resulting "pool fire" would spread as the LNG pool expanded away from its source and continued evaporating. A pool fire is intense, burning far more hotly and rapidly than oil or gasoline fires.<sup>9</sup> It cannot be extinguished — all the LNG must be consumed before it goes out. Because an LNG pool fire is so hot, its thermal radiation may injure people and damage property a considerable distance from the fire itself. Many experts agree that a large pool fire, especially on water (due to heat transfer), is the most serious LNG hazard.<sup>10</sup> Other Safety Hazards. LNG spilled on water could regasify almost instantly in a "flameless explosion," LNG vapor clouds are not toxic, but they could cause asphyxiation by displacing breathable air. The extent of such contact would likely be limited, however, as a major spill would likely result in a more serious fire.</p> <p>Terrorism Hazards. LNG tankers and land-based facilities could be vulnerable to terrorism. Tankers might be physically attacked in a variety of ways to destroy their cargo — or commandeered for use as weapons against coastal targets.</p> <p>LNG terminal facilities might also be physically attacked with explosives or through other means. Some LNG facilities may also be indirectly disrupted by "cyberattacks" or attacks on regional electricity grids and communications networks which could in turn affect dependent LNG control and safety systems."</p> <p>I don't believe that these issues have been adequately described or assessed in the Aurora LNG final application. I don't believe terrorism hazards have been considered at all.</p> <p>"Federal safety regulations require LNG terminals to be surrounded by "exclusion zones" to protect neighboring communities in the event of a pool fire or flammable vapor cloud. Critics of these LNG safety provisions argue that the thermal and vapor exclusion zones they specify may be too small, in part because the "design spills" on which they are based are too small.</p> <p>They argue that catastrophes such as terrorist attacks on storage tanks could release far more LNG far more quickly than assumed in siting plans — resulting in larger, hotter pool fires or larger vapor clouds closer to nearby populations. Critics also argue that federally allowable levels of thermal radiation from pool fires are too high, since radiation at these levels could still burn people in a relatively short period of time."</p> <p>I don't believe that descriptions of what the effects to neighbouring communities in the event of a pool fire or flammable vapor cloud are adequate. The Aurora LNG final application really does not adequately look at human health in any accident or malfunction scenario, or at the cumulative or residual effects. I am going to assume that since the highest likelihood scenario, if a major accident or malfunction happened, would be that the community of Dodge Cove would just no longer exist, therefore cumulative and residual effects do not need to be looked at? Due to proximity of the proposed LNG terminal to Dodge Cove, the overlap of any major accident seems to have the potential to be able to completely incinerate the community.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

741 (2 of 5)	2017-02-22	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>"As noted earlier in this report, LNG spills on water are potentially more dangerous than spills on land because LNG may spread much more quickly over water and is not readily contained. Consequently, some experts believe an LNG tanker accident or attack resulting in a major spill could pose a hazard to coastal communities along the tanker's route. EXPERTS SAY... LNG ships carry four to six tanks. If about half of a single 6.6-million-gallon tank spilled from a 54-square-foot hole and the vapors ignited, the fire would "cause significant damage to structures, equipment, and machinery" within a 1,280-foot radius and leave second-degree burns on people more than three-quarters of a mile away, according to Sandia's study, which measured impact on open water. In a city, variables such as buildings would affect the fire's path and intensity. Sandia's worst-case scenario measured the result of LNG spilling simultaneously from three tanks, which "would set structures aflame out to 2,067 feet and burn people as far as [1.3 miles] away," says study coauthor Mike Hightower. Sandia is now studying scenarios in which tanks are breached successively."</p> <p>The fact that the Aurora LNG terminal would be at the main entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour, and the berthing only about 500 m to the centre of the that main channel, there is a direct risk to all boats passing through, including large cruise ships and BC ferries. Aurora LNG section 9.9.1 - Vessel Grounding or Collision "credible worst case scenario...is a hull breach and containment failure of one LNG membrane tank and one marine fuel tank."</p> <p>That does not seem to a credible worst-case scenario, if Sandia Laboratories is studying scenarios in which tanks are breached successively than why is that not reflected in the final application. It may be a low risk of happening, but we need to see the consequences of the actual worst-case scenario, and it would have a high consequence.</p> <p>University of Arkansas chemical engineering professor Jerry Havens, points out that something need go wrong only once.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG final application 9.9.1 also claims that it is very unlikely for the tankers to become grounded in shallow waters, collide with another vessel along the shipping route, or collide with marine terminal infrastructure.</p> <p>I question this conclusion as the reality is that several freighters have created collisions, or grounded themselves on the shore or on rocks in this area. High winds create extreme conditions which don't seem to be taken into account in this application, or the history of large ship accidents in Prince Rupert Harbour and the surrounding area. There is also a list of 35 incidents involving LNG ships (up to the year 2013, since then there has been more).</p> <p>(CH-IV International - Safety History of International LNG Operations - Appendix B - Chronological Summary of Incidents Involving LNG Ships)</p> <p><b>"THE FIRE</b></p> <p>1. LNG immediately begins to evaporate when it spills. A vapor cloud forms and grows, and you hope there's no spark. Even with a spark, only the cloud's edges, where 5 to 15 percent of the air is LNG, can ignite. Yet if that part catches fire, the whole thing burns.</p> <p>2. In an attack, a spark would probably be present as the LNG began to spill, so a fire would start right away. Because the LNG hits the water faster than it all can evaporate, it would form a pool on top of the water. As more spilled, the pool — and the fire — would grow.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
741 (3 of 5)	2017-02-22	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>3. The LNG would continue feeding the blaze (imagine the fire being attached to the pool) until all the fuel evaporated and burned off, which could take anywhere from three to forty minutes. By then, anything within reach could have ignited and set off other fires.</p> <p>We believe remote siting is the primary factor in safety. Because of the inevitable uncertainties inherent in large-scale use of new technologies and the vulnerability of the facilities to natural phenomena and sabotage, the public can be best protected by placing these facilities away from densely populated areas."</p> <p>Throughout the Aurora LNG final application Accidents or Malfunctions section there seems to be a lack of true description of worst-case scenarios. There seems to be many "manageable" scenarios described, yet preventative and response measures are inadequate if a real worst-case scenario NOT described in the application was to take place.</p> <p>"This is serious stuff," Menino says (mayor of Boston Harbour) "I take it very seriously, and my public-safety officials take it very seriously. We don't have the equipment to put down an explosion of an LNG tank. They say, 'Well, it will never happen.' Well, 9/11 hadn't happened either. We live in a different era."</p> <p>"Most hazard analyses for LNG terminals and shipping depend on computer models to approximate the effects of hypothetical accidents.</p> <p>Historical LNG safety experiments have been limited in scale and scope. But LNG hazards models are extremely complex and inherently uncertain, relying on calculations and input assumptions about which fair-minded analysts may legitimately disagree. Even small differences in an LNG hazard model have led to significantly different conclusions. Referring to previous LNG safety zone studies, FERC noted in 2003 that "distances have been estimated to range from 1400 feet to more than 4000 feet for hazardous thermal radiation."</p> <p>This is hardly comforting as the fact that 4000 feet = 1.2 km, and the community of Dodge Cove will only be 1/2 km away from the Aurora LNG terminal and therefore possibly in hazardous thermal radiation zone.</p> <p>"Each of the available studies appear to have significant limitations ...for example, the ABSG Consulting study released by FERC in May 2004, which reviewed existing LNG hazard models, concluded that 1)No release models are available that take into account the true structure of an LNG carrier 2)No pool spread models are available that account for wave action or currents 3)Relatively few experimental data are available for validation for models involving LNG spills on water, and there are no data available for spills as large as the spills considered in this study. "</p> <p>If there is a lack of data - in existing hazard models - than how can we actually know the impacts that would take place, especially with the south ends of Digby Island having much wave action and currents, as the tide pushes in and out of Prince Rupert Harbour every 6 hours. If there is no data on large spills, and the data for small spills is being used to calculate what a large spill would be like, than that is a big data gap.</p> <p>"It is often argued that a significant hazard which is nonetheless highly unlikely does not represent an unacceptable risk to the public. In this view, worst-case hazard studies alone do not provide a sufficient basis for evaluating public safety. Unfortunately, few LNG safety studies comprehensively and convincingly address the probability of catastrophic accidents or attacks actually occurring."</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

741 (4 of 5)	2017-02-22	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>It seems that the Aurora LNG final application fails to comprehensively look at both the worst-case scenarios for accident or malfunction of the terminal and it's impacts to local communities (especially Dodge Cove at 1/2 km away) and also at the unacceptable RISK to the PUBLIC. The proposed site alone for the Aurora LNG terminal proves this, and the lack of the Section 9 to accurately describe impacts to the local communities and residents seems clear.</p> <p>"Civil and Criminal Liability. One reason LNG tanker and terminal operators seek to ensure public safety is to avoid civil and criminal liability from an LNG accident. Even if no federal or state regulations are violated, LNG companies still face civil liability for personal injury or wrongful death in the event of an accident. In the Bellingham case, for example, the pipeline owner and associated defendants agreed to pay a \$75 million settlement to the families of two children killed in the accident.<sup>91</sup> In 2002, El Paso Corporation settled wrongful death and personal injury lawsuits stemming from a natural gas pipeline explosion near Carlsbad, New Mexico which killed 12 campers. Although the terms of those settlements were not disclosed, two additional lawsuits sought a total of \$171 million in damages."</p> <p>Over 27 Land LNG Facility Incidents are listed in : The CH-IV International - Safety History of International LNG Operations - Appendix A - Chronological Summary of Incidents Involving Land-Based LNG Facilities, which only lists accidents/incidents up until 2013. Another 3 have happened since then. These 30 LNG related terminal events include many large and small incidents, and are only the ones that are reported. This does NOT include all the other natural gas related incidents, including all the PIPELINE accidents, of which a natural gas pipeline will be feeding gas to the LNG terminal, so can not be discounted.</p> <p>"Banning Onshore LNG Terminals. As some have suggested, Congress could ban the construction of any new LNG terminals onshore in the belief that, due to their hazards, such terminals simply should not be built anywhere near people.<sup>94</sup> Many "remote siting" advocates would likely support such a ban. Indeed, developers have already proposed numerous offshore LNG terminals — largely to avoid public safety concerns."</p> <p>One of the things that the BC environmental assessment process does not consider: whether this site is an accurate location in the first place. Should onshore LNG terminals even be proposed? Why are alternative locations - onshore or offshore - not also being assessed and put forward for the choice of what the best location would be?</p> <p>(Even Russia does an environmental assessment on a minimum of 3 locations for every LNG terminal proposed - why is Canada not setting forth siting regulations?) I would like to see a list of the other locations that Nexen employees verbally claim to have "considered" as none of those locations are public knowledge or addressed in the Aurora LNG applications, and it would be interesting to see - why was this location on Digby Island supposedly chosen above these other sites - especially with the difficulties of proximity to residents, communities, existing marine traffic zones, and the only airport servicing this entire area.</p> <p>"LNG is inherently hazardous and its infrastructure is potentially attractive to terrorists. The recent LNG terminal fire in Algeria demonstrates that, despite technological improvements since the 1940s, LNG facilities can still experience serious accidents."</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
741 (5 of 5)	2017-02-22	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>All of the excerpts from the LNG Import Terminals, Siting, Safety and Regulation really deal with some major concepts and data gaps that the Aurora LNG final application does not deal with. Since this would be one of the largest LNG export terminals in Canada (of which Canada does not have one single LNG export facility yet - and lacks solid regulations for LNG export) and the closest proximity to communities, these existing studies and problems with hazard modelling and data gaps need to be addressed. Are the residents of Dodge Cove, Crippen Cove, and Prince Rupert to be human guinea pigs? If a major accident happens, there will be drastic consequences for the people that live here.</p> <p>LNG Import Terminals: Siting, Safety and Regulation CRS Report for Congress <a href="http://www.iags.org/CRS_RL32205.pdf">http://www.iags.org/CRS_RL32205.pdf</a> (note, there seems to be two versions of this report - some of these quoted statements are from a printed version, but this online link fails to include a few of the same statements) <a href="https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL32205.html">https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL32205.html</a> <a href="http://www.bostonmagazine.com/2010/06/safe-harbor/">http://www.bostonmagazine.com/2010/06/safe-harbor/</a> <a href="http://www.defensemianetwork.com/stories/u-s-coast-guard-countering-maritime-security-risk/">http://www.defensemianetwork.com/stories/u-s-coast-guard-countering-maritime-security-risk/</a></p>	
742	2017-02-22	Sheila Peters - Smithers, British Columbia	<p>I am very concerned about the possibility of an LNG project on Digby Island. There is already more than enough pressure on this rich marine eco-system and the important archaeological sites in the area have barely been studied. A project of this size in this location would be a mistake.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
743	2017-02-22	Margaret Johnson	<p>Dear Environmental Assessment Office: Re: Please do NOT allow the proposed Aurora LNG fracked gas plant to be built. It is with a sense of urgency that I am writing to you. I am deeply concerned that this proposal should be denied for the following reasons: The negative impact on salmon and wildlife; The negative impact on the health and safety of the surrounding communities. The negative impact on our climate.. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS PLANT TO BE CONSTRUCTED. Sincerely, Margaret Johnson, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
744	2017-02-22	Colt Cash	<p>Sincerely, Colt Cash, Penticton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

745	2017-02-22	Janice and Dave Rider	<p>My husband and I recently spent time in the Great Bear Rain Forest, where we had the privilege of watching chinook, chum, pink, and coho salmon in various estuaries and rivers. These salmon and the water that nurtures them are, quite literally, life for the grizzly and black bears in the area; for birds as diverse as gulls, bald eagles, great blue herons, and ravens; for trees and plants nurtured by decomposing salmon bodies amongst their vegetation; for First Nations people; and for smaller organisms in water that we simply never stop to consider.</p> <p>We are deeply upset about Nexen's proposal to install Aurora LNG, owned by a Chinese oil corporation with no investment in our safety and well-being, in the area of Prince Rupert on Digby Island. We recognize that this area is extremely similar to the one that we visited in and around Klemtu. The wild salmon around Digby Island - coho, steelhead, and sockeye - are extremely vulnerable to interference. They also support flora and fauna. Digby's wetlands, which are necessary for the continued health of migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, cranes, herons, and song birds, would be compromised as would the eel grass habitat and Delusion Bay's serenity. The harbour porpoise, already comprised by activity in the area, would be further set at risk.</p> <p>And what of First Nations people here? Is their strong opposition to this proposal being considered? The plant site would be less than one kilometre from Dodge Cove which means that it would violate international siting standards.</p> <p>And what of BC's legislated climate targets?</p> <p>Climate change is fundamentally and irrevocably tied to water issues - ocean water concerns, wetland water concerns, and various water tributary concerns. Whenever decisions are made, we need to ask, "How will this impact water?" We cannot afford to put drinking water at risk. Neither can we afford to put the species that depend on pristine water at risk, including ourselves.</p> <p>We strongly feel that Nexen's proposal should not go ahead. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Janice and Dave Rider, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
746	2017-02-22	Sue Maxwell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I grew up in Kitimat and know the beauty and richness of the marine life of that area. Please prevent the LNG plant from being built by Delusion Bay. Our salmon stocks are declining so we should be preserving all the critical habitat to allow for their return (as well as getting rid of open net fish farms). We also need to be looking at climate change as the biggest threat we are currently facing, so prevent LNG as well as flaring will ensure a decrease in GHG emissions. Preventing the flaring will also prevent numerous other air emissions that may threaten bird life.</p> <p>The reasons to prevent this further expansion of LNG are numerous but the reasons to proceed are few (and getting fewer) as these projects provide few new permanent jobs, that may not be filled by British Columbians and BC is offering more and more subsidies for these plants that eventually BC will be paying for the environmental destruction. The costs far outweigh any potential benefits. It is not worth the risk.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sue Maxwell, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
747	2017-02-22	G. Alan Robertson	<p>Dear EAO, You cannot possibly do an assessment on this proposed LNG plant and find it meets the criteria for approval. On so many fronts it does not but mainly the very real danger of losing B.C.'s vital Skeena salmon fishery. Your conscience alone should tell you the destruction of this estuary would be a criminal act of unforgivable proportion, especially added to the Petronas proposal. This is madness ! Stand up to your responsibility and reject this proposal!</p> <p>Sincerely, G. Alan Robertson, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
748	2017-02-22	Brian Fink	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Brian Fink, Philadelphia cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
749	2017-02-22	Kate Archibald	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Healthy wild salmon populations are just too important to the health of the BC coast. Wild salmon are already in a very precarious position as it is foreseeable now, as it never has been before, that one day they could vanish from this coast. We MUST do ALL that we possible can to preserve the health of their habitat. A new fracked gas plant on Digby Island is one more nail in the coffin. I cannot sit back and allow this to happen on my watch, as someone who was born and raised on this coast and has been nourished by wild salmon since before I was even born.</p> <p>Thank you for listening, Sincerely, Kate Archibald, Manson's Landing cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
750	2017-02-22	Theresa Hood	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Fracked natural gas is not sustainable. Fracking is dangerous and detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>We must come up with economics that nourish our environment as well as the humans that live on this wonderful planet.</p> <p>These are the times when we are being called to make radical changes in the way we live and do business.</p> <p>If not now, when? If not us, who?</p> <p>Sincerely, Theresa Hood, Nanaimo cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
751	2017-02-23	Karl Bilodeau	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Karl Bilodeau, Whistler cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

752	2017-02-23	Faizel Desai	<p>Dear EAO,  RE: Aurora LNG</p> <p>The Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. I oppose the Aurora LNG project for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>The AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p><b>NOT CANADIAN OWNED</b> The Aurora LNG project is not Canadian owned. The Chinese oil giant CNOOC owns it and only has Chinese interests in mind. As past history indicates, they may choose to use only Chinese labour, Chinese equipment and not respect our Laws, environment, labour or otherwise.</p> <p>Canadians need to be employed but our environment needs to be protected and our citizens need to benefit from our resources. If we can use LNG to power our hydro-electric grid, power our vehicles or heat our homes, we should have access to our natural gas first. Canadians First.</p> <p>Please reject the Aurora LNG given my concerns noted above. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Faizel Desai, Surrey  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
753	2017-02-23	Jody Lownds	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please accept this letter commenting on the proposed fracked gas plant proposed by Nexen to be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island.</p> <p>The location of the proposed project is right beside a critical habitat area for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon in addition to important wetland areas for migrating geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The project as proposed would directly damage these wetlands and critical habitat.</p> <p>The project as proposed would also produce an additional 6.7 million tonnes of GHGs per year (NOT including emissions involved in plant construction or shipping and burning of the fossil fuel overseas.</p> <p>Given the environmental interests involved and the risks posed to those interests by this project, it simply should not be permitted to proceed.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Jody Lownds, Revelstoke  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

754 (1 of 4)	2017-02-23	Graeme Pole	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman RE: Comment on Aurora LNG Prince Rupert at Risk</p> <p>The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines due diligence as: "The care that a reasonable person exercises to avoid harm to other persons or their property." As the debate on British Columbia's proposed liquefied natural gas (LNG) industry enters its fourth year, it is past time to bring one aspect of that industry under scrutiny – the safety of people in proximity to LNG vessels and terminals.</p> <p>The default document on this topic is one created by the LNG industry itself.</p> <p>In 1997, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) published Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties. The document is clear and succinct in describing how to enhance LNG safety.</p> <p>LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from a spill or release cannot affect civilians.</p> <p>LNG ship berths must be far from the ship transit fairway to prevent collision, and since all other vessels must be considered an ignition source.</p> <p>LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses now and into the future.</p> <p>Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided, due to greater avigation risk.</p> <p>Waterways containing navigation hazards are to be avoided as LNG ports.</p> <p>Anyone familiar with the marine approaches to Howe Sound, Prince Rupert, and Kitimat will be aware that to propose marine transport of LNG from terminals in those locations violates all of the SIGTTO standards referred to above.</p> <p>In March the federal government approved Woodfibre LNG near Squamish. If built, this small-scale facility would generate 40 round-trip transits of LNG vessels in Howe Sound each year. Six LNG facilities are proposed for Kitimat at the head of Douglas Channel – a waterway derided by critics of the Northern Gateway bitumen pipeline because of its inherent dangers to large vessels. Yet up to 460 round-trip LNG vessel transits could take place each year if all six plants were built. Four large terrestrial LNG export facilities are proposed for the Prince Rupert area, along with three, smaller floating facilities. At full build-out, the large plants would generate 796 round-trip transits of LNG vessels into port, the smaller facilities 208.</p> <p>That's almost three round-trips per day. In 2014, the Prince Rupert Port Authority reported that 494 vessels called at port terminals to take on and offload trade resources and goods, and that was a year when coal export was markedly down.</p> <p>At Prince Rupert, the key concerns is not that LNG export could triple industrial vessel transits, and that the BC government sees no harm in promoting that possibility. Vessels in the Q-Max LNG carrier class are 345 metres long with a capacity of 266,000 cubic metres of LNG, comparable in size to the large ships that now dock at the Fairview Container Port. The potential tripling of marine traffic at Prince Rupert would principally involve extremely large vessels carrying a dangerous commodity in a confined waterway.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
754 (2 of 4)	2017-02-23	Graeme Pole	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The likelihood of a breach to one of the five or six storage tanks on a typical LNG vessel – whether accidental or intentional – is low. It has not happened since LNG marine transport began in 1959. But LNG itself as a substance, through its manufacturing process and in its steady-state in storage, possesses innate hazards. LNG terminals and storage facilities have suffered catastrophic explosions. As more vessels are added to LNG fleets, making more voyages into confined and treacherous waters such as found on BC's north coast, the chances of at least an accidental breach in a marine setting will increase. World events of the past two decades indicate that the risk of an intentional breach cannot be dismissed. For the LNG industry to tout past "safe" performance as an absolute indicator of future probability is hubristic. What would happen if LNG were to escape from a marine vessel storage tank? In 2004 and 2008, the US Department of Energy commissioned Sandia National Laboratories to find out. Sandia reported that an instantaneous fireball would not be likely. What would be more likely is a "cold explosion" known as a rapid phase transition. The temperature of LNG is -161.5°C. Escaping from a vessel, LNG would release a blast as it froze the ocean surface, then evaporate as it warmed and picked up water vapour to form a low, heavier-than-air vapour cloud that would drift outward. The larger the breach, the larger the cloud.</p> <p>Outright ignition of regasified LNG would require it to mix with air in a range of 5 percent to 15 percent LNG. If this cloud of LNG vapour were to spread from a vessel or a terminal with optimal conditions for ignition, an aerial fireball would be possible. That ignition would typically "backtrack" from the spark to the source of the cloud. But with an onshore wind a fiery blanket could disperse over land. Sandia's research suggested that typical aerial dispersal distances from a small breach would be 3050 m from a near-shore source, and 4600 m from an offshore source.</p> <p>LNG burns at more than 500°C. Sandia's reports described three zones of hazard around an LNG vessel should a breach occur with ignition. Within 500 metres of the vessel, death to all living things on the water, surfacing from the water, in the air, or on adjacent land would be likely. This could result from shrapnel, incineration, cryogenic freezing or from suffocation. Between 500 metres and 1.6 km from the vessel, these threats lessen but are still critical. Second-degree burns to exposed human flesh would typically result from 30 seconds of exposure. Structural fires, grass fires, and forest fires would be ignited. Effects would lessen moving from 1.6 km out to 3.5 km, beyond which the hazard is considered negligible. In the US, these hazard zones have been embodied in regulations governing LNG facility location. It is also standard for LNG ports to have fireboats that are foam-capable, as use of water on an LNG-fed fire would exacerbate it.</p> <p>Plotting the Sandia hazard zones along the shipping lanes in Howe Sound and at Prince Rupert and Kitimat is informative. For example, all human settlement in Prince Rupert, Port Edward, Dodge Cove, and Seal Cove is within the hazard zones. More than 13,000 residents are at risk, along with up to 3,000 people who may be visiting at any given time. More than 60,000 passengers depart the port on ferries and water taxis each year in these hazard zones. In Howe Sound, xxx people would be at risk. Not surprisingly, xxx municipal governments and xxx regional districts are on the record as opposing Woodfibre LNG.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

754 (3 of 4)	2017-02-23	Graeme Pole	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In an emergency, the public expects that emergency infrastructure will be safe from massive harm, or that a back-up plan exists to patch together responses if key infrastructure is damaged or destroyed. This is clearly not the case at Prince Rupert. LNG vessels transiting to the proposed WCC LNG facility on Tuck Inlet would ply the length of the Prince Rupert Harbour shipping lane and its approaches. The Fairview Container Terminal is on the verge of the 500-metre hazard zone, as is a 4 km length of the CN Rail line.</p> <p>The Coast Guard base, City Hall and its Emergency Operations Centre, the Fire Hall and its 911 call centre, the Prince Rupert Port Authority with its Port Security Operations Centre and Emergency Operations Centre, the BC Ferries and Alaska Marine Highway terminals, the Via Rail terminal, the Seal Cove Coast Guard Search and Rescue helicopter base and BC Ambulance medevac base, and the RCMP detachment all lie within 1.6 km of that shipping lane. Prince Rupert Regional Hospital and the BC Ambulance station are on the 1.6 km line.</p> <p>And to cement brazen disregard for the SIGTTO guidelines, LNG vessels approaching WCC LNG would pass other LNG vessels berthed for loading at the proposed Aurora LNG facility on Digby Island, at a point where the navigable waterway is scarcely 1 km wide. They would also pass LNG vessels docked at New Times LNG and Orca LNG on the Prince Rupert waterfront.</p> <p>Boston is the only US city with an LNG facility. The Everett terminal in Boston Harbour imports LNG – meaning that vessels enter the harbour loaded and leave empty – the opposite to what is proposed for BC's north coast.</p> <p>Typically, only one LNG vessel every eight days makes the trip to Everett LNG, but the stir that each passage creates is instructive in terms of appraising risk. When four days from port, an LNG vessel approaching Boston must contact the US Coast Guard with a manifest and crew list. The Coast Guard runs checks on the crew. When 12 miles from port, the Coast Guard boards the vessel to inspect it and to begin surveillance to ensure that all other vessels keep 500 yards away. When five miles out, a pilot boards the vessel and four tugboats are engaged. Passage into port is only permitted in daylight and with clear visibility. Five armed boats, two from the Coast Guard and one each from three police agencies, escort the LNG vessel into harbour. Law enforcement officers patrol all piers and jetties along the route, with a helicopter or two dedicated to observe from above. Bridge traffic over the harbour is halted as the vessel makes way beneath. Marinas are shuttered and guarded for 20 minutes before and after each transit. The security cost? About 80,000 USD per transit. The economic cost? Unknown.</p> <p>The Port of St. John, New Brunswick, is home to Canaport LNG, Canada's only LNG import facility. Transport Canada has implemented Boston-like measures for LNG transits: mandatory security screening of LNG vessel crews; a "marine safety zone" of 0.5 nautical miles (926 m) around any LNG vessel; no anchoring within 1.5 nautical miles of an LNG vessel; and no overtaking of LNG vessels when they are underway in the harbour. When an LNG vessel is offloading at Canaport LNG, a 620 m radius from the centre of the terminal is off-limits to all marine traffic except tugs and service craft employed with that vessel. Given the large "sail areas" of empty LNG vessels, the harbour master may consider other "special provisions" to accommodate them, or may order them to leave port when they are empty and it is windy.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
754 (4 of 4)	2017-02-23	Graeme Pole	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In 2006 and 2013, the Canadian government rejected plans for LNG vessel transits through Head Harbour Passage and Passamaquoddy Bay, New Brunswick, to a proposed LNG facility in Maine. Describing those Canadian waters as "a unique and highly productive marine ecosystem," the 2013 letter from the Canadian ambassador to the US Federal Energy Regulatory Commission summarized concerns related to "the environmental, navigational, and safety risks as well as the adverse economic consequences...". Which begs the question:</p> <p>What is so different about the setting for LNG vessel traffic proposed for BC?</p> <p>Although piloting will be required, Transport Canada has not announced its plans for LNG carriers on BC's coast. According to its website, the Prince Rupert Port Authority is considering implementing "safe transit zones" and "traffic separation patterns to define specific routes for specific types of vessels." In other ports, separations of as much as an hour are required between LNG carriers and other watercraft.</p> <p>What if, as is likely, setbacks and separations are mandated around LNG vessels approaching BC's coast? For one thing, LNG plants with planned multiple berths (Aurora, Pacific Northwest, and WCC) would not be allowed to have more than one LNG vessel at dock. But of greater importance, with the possibility of three LNG vessels a day entering and three a day exiting the port of Prince Rupert, what would be the effect on BC Ferries, the Alaska Marine Highway, the airport ferry, the Metlakatla ferry, water taxis, commercial fishing (especially salmon and herring openings), tour operators, cruise ships, and recreational boating and fishing? Why aren't these potential economic impacts and inconveniences being weighed against the touted benefits of the LNG industry? Although the issue was raised by the public during "consultation," why wasn't the possibility of restrictions to marine traffic included in the descriptions of any of the proposed LNG projects? Is it because the backlash would be over public safety, not mere inconvenience? And who in government has investigated the insurance requirements for LNG carriers and ports? Each LNG vessel is typically its own limited liability company, flying a flag of convenience; its owners beyond the reach of law should calamity occur.</p> <p>Last words on the issue of LNG marine safety and due diligence go to those responsible – industry and government.</p> <p>Engaging with our stakeholders in open and honest dialogue is a critical part of the way we do business and essential in helping us to understand concerns, share information and build strong relationships. In carrying out these activities, we are guided by five principles: inclusion, respect, timeliness, responsiveness, and accountability.</p> <p>WCC LNG Project Description</p> <p>If spilled, LNG evaporates into the atmosphere, leaving no residue on either soil or water. No environmental cleanup is required.</p> <p>BC government website, LNG fact card #5</p> <p>Graeme Pole Hazelton, BC</p> <p>This letter was created with the use of an online letter writing tool at <a href="http://wildernesscommittee.org">wildernesscommittee.org</a></p>	
755	2017-02-23	Robert Mann	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am concerned about the future health of B.C.'s diverse salmon runs, the great part they play in larger ecosystems and as well, the important and commercially viable food source they represent to this province.</p> <p>I hope the Skeena river salmon run can be well protected. If the Nexen, Aurora LNG plant plan will do harm to the Skeena salmon, if this is what good science concludes or has concluded, I hope measures will be taken by government to reconsider the LNG development plans in such a sensitive area.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Mann</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Mann, North Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>



756	2017-02-23	brad higgs	Dear EAO, Please reconsider this proposal brad higgs, Westmoreland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
757	2017-02-23	Amy Quinn	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Amy Quinn, Grafton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
758 (1 of 4)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 1)	<p>The negative effects that the Aurora LNG project will have on the community of Dodge Cove, and the town of Prince Rupert, have not been accurately assessed. CNOOC Nexen seems to be avoiding many questions that the provincial and federal governments ask them to further provide info on - by saying that they don't have to, since the AIR did not ask them to. Well, whether or not they have been asked to in the AIR, when the Canadian government is asking for further info, or when local communities have unanswered concerns on their negative impacts and safety it seems that a foreign national corporation that wishes to come onto Canadian soil should have to answer these questions.</p> <p>Let's look to another LNG terminal and see the effects. <a href="http://www.eca-watch.org/problems/eu_russ/russia/sakhalin/LazebnikKorsakovLNG_04dec04.htm">http://www.eca-watch.org/problems/eu_russ/russia/sakhalin/LazebnikKorsakovLNG_04dec04.htm</a></p> <p>The construction of the Liquid Natural Gas plant (a part of the Sakhalin II Project) and its negative impacts upon the local infrastructure as well as the inhabitants of the town of Korsakov December 4, 2004 This article was prepared by Lina Lazebnik, a teacher at the Korsakov Middle School No. 2, and a member of a local grass-roots group of citizens known as "Knowledge is Strength". Assistance with this article was provided by Dmitry Lisitsyn, the head of the NGO known as Sakhalin Environmental Watch.</p> <p>This is a translation to English from the original Russian.</p> <p>In many ways, the problems we are seeing here derive from the fact that the Sakhalin Energy Company did not do the baseline work that it needed to ahead of time. It didn't create the appropriate conditions for the Sakhalin II project to really get established. For this reason, all the stress and strain that was felt at the very beginning of construction was to fall on the shoulders of the local people, and upon the local officials and the town itself. Another basic reason for the immense social impact here was the fact that there was no individual attention paid to the impending social problems here by anyone amongst the contractors or subcontractors-- the very people who should have had an interest in what was happening. All this time Sakhalin Energy has been entering into contracts with dozens of other companies. But the main issue for the management teams here is to minimize expenses at each stage of fulfilling their contracts. This means that the management folks are really only trying to save money at every step of the game.</p> <p>At the very early stages of construction (that is, from August to December of 2003), there were about 1,500 workers who descended upon the town of Korsakov--living there for a year, either in the town itself or in one of the small villages nearby. These imported workers became inhabitants of the town, paying no taxes, and availing themselves of all the social services and infrastructures during this entire time. And despite all the bonuses and the investments into the development of Sakhalin which the Sakhalin Energy folks like to boast about, the local government budgets have ended up running very large deficits over the last two years. There were simply not enough social-support resources to go around, even for the long-term residents of the town. What's more, the government budgets here have no way to withstand the influx of yet another 1,500 people (by the fall of 2004 the number of imported workers here had increased to nearly 3,000).</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.</p> <p>A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan that will include an infection control policy aligned with the Northern Health's Infection Control Plan Best Management Guide for Industrial Camps</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
758 (2 of 4)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 1)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Because of the complete lack of preparation for the conditions that might arise, the appearance of such a large number of new people (i.e., the construction workers for the Liquid Natural Gas, or LNG plant) has caused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a decline in the overall water supply system for the city;</li> <li>• a decline in the sanitary system that disposes of all industrial and domestic wastes;</li> <li>• a serious increase in the overload on medical services in the town, services which are fully provided for by the local government budgets, and which include the hospital, local clinics, and ongoing ambulance services;</li> <li>• a serious increase in the incidence of epidemic illnesses in the region;</li> <li>• a serious increase in the amount of violent crimes committed against the local residents by the newcomers.</li> </ul> <p>The local reservoirs have not been able to provide enough water for Korsakov for several years now. The water pipeline system here is quite old as well, and has not been repaired or updated for at least ten years now. There is systematic rationing of water now, with water turned on for three hours in the morning and three hours in the evening. Even then, in several parts of the town it is quite common for the water to be turned off anywhere from several days at a time to almost a month.</p> <p>And now the situation is becoming even less fortuitous, since Sakhalin Energy decided to lay one of its oil pipelines right through a small watershed where water is collected [for the city reservoir]. This has ruined the topsoil near the rivers and streams here, especially in some of the steeper parts of the watershed, leading to a lot of soil runoff and sediment pollution in the reservoirs that serve as the source of public water. The local authorities were even forced to stop using them. Local experts now predict that ".....Korsakov might be without water for the entire winter." In sum, the appearance of 1,500 new residents in the town who are working on the plant has really caused a sharp increase in the demand for water--while, on the other hand, the oil pipeline that was laid by Sakhalin II has put two of the reservoirs out of commission, removing about 40% of all the water that once was used on a daily basis by the town.</p> <p>The sanitation system here, which also has not been repaired or updated for more than ten years, really cannot manage to treat the waste waters that come from Korsakov at this point. As a result, a very significant amount of untreated water is now being dumped into the sea here. Moreover, the growth in local population did not bring in any improvements in the treatment facilities. For the last year, Sakhalin Energy has been sending its waste waters from the LNG plant site to the existing treatment centre for Korsakov. And once they had managed to overload this system, they began to send their waste waters to the treatment plants in the neighbouring villages of Dachnoe and Solovyovka, where the local systems are extremely old and close to a complete and dangerous breakdown. This method of dealing with the problem continued right up to October 2004, that is, until a new treatment centre began to take on the waste waters in the new village that was set up for the construction workers in Prigorod.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

758 (3 of 4)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 1)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>One should note that the construction workers who were brought here hail from many different countries, such as Turkey, Pakistan, Kirgyzia, Uzbekistan, Moldova, Ukraine, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, as well as from many other cities from all over Russia. They brought with them their own diseases and infections, including more than a few venereal cases. There are a number of rather exotic illnesses that have appeared here. The local Korsakov physicians have no experience [with these] and are not sure how to treat them. Already there are cases of AIDs. There are also a number of new cases of tuberculosis and pediculosis [lice]. Official statistics show that, in the time immediately after construction of the LNG plant began, the number of people in the town suffering from pneumonia rose precipitously. And this is not your run-of-the-mill type of pneumonia. What is really unusual is that local people are coming down with pneumonia year-round now, and not just during the short season that once was the rule.</p> <p>For the most part, the construction workers at the plant have no medical coverage at all. And despite all their efforts, the medical teams already serving Korsakov have not been able to force the contractors at the plant to cover the medical costs for those suffering from venereal diseases or AIDs, as is required by Russian law. And insofar as some 1,500 workers have been living in and around the town of Korsakov for over a year now (and many still live there now), one way or another there has been no end of contact with the local residents. This has led to the spread of many diseases and to a growing overload for the hospital here, which had a hard enough time taking care of the existing health problems for the local people before.</p> <p>The problem here really comes down to the fact that a very large number of the workers here have no medical policies. Correspondingly, the people who are employing them have not been paying for any of the medical services that are provided by the local health care system. In the vast majority of cases, the Korsakov medical teams have been forced to render services for free to all the workers at the LNG plant-- not only in cases of severe illnesses but also in cases where ambulance services were required. This has meant ultimately that the local people have had to pay for these services, since every one of them is covered by their own local employers, who pay fees for the public medical insurance policies that support the local health care budget, which in turn goes to pay for all medical services in the region.</p> <p>A good example of what is happening is an incident that took place at the beginning of 2004 in the Korsakov hospital. A plant worker was brought in after he had gotten into a drunken brawl and injured his eye. As it turned out, the hospital had to spend the equivalent of 120 thousand rubles [about USD \$4,275] on his treatment. For three months the doctors requested that his employers pay for the treatment. But, in the end, the company refused to pay anything.</p> <p>This is not an unusual case at all: there are many such incidents to cite. This is a town where an LNG plant is being built, where around 5,000 people now live-- and there is only one small health care center that can provide primary care. In other words, we aren't talking here about a place with large-scale medical facilities. What this all means is that any serious outbreak or other health problems among the workers could easily become a tremendous burden upon the Korsakov medical staff. By Russian standards, a town with around 5,000 people should have a functioning hospital with several dozen doctors, each with their own specialization. There should be high-tech equipment available, with in-patient facilities that can house a few dozen patients at least.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
758 (4 of 4)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 1)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Another incident happened in March of this year, when there was a case of massive poisoning at one of the larger subcontracting groups, known as the Amur Tiger Company. Some twenty-five people were brought into the Korsakov county hospital with a diagnosis of severe food poisoning. After research into the matter by the state public health officials, the cause of the poisoning became obvious. There had been numerous and severe violations of public health standards in the place where food was being prepared for the company workers. Many of the food products given to the workers had "use-by" dates that had long since past. And the food preparers themselves had not been subject to any kind of inspection, medical or otherwise. (In one case the chief cook was found to have a severe infection on his hand, with pus oozing out.) The foodstuffs were being stored in non-refrigerated areas, and food that had not been consumed the day before was simply served again the next day, etc. The office of the mayor of Korsakov estimates that the treatment alone for all those who came down with food poisoning would cost the county the equivalent of 15% of all the taxes and land-rental fees that the various LNG companies had paid into public coffers during the previous year.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Korsakov medical teams tried to contact the companies that had been contracted to build the plant. However, by May of 2004, when the construction had already been going on for nine months, with a total of 2,000 workers taking part-- none of the companies at hand, neither the Sakhalin Energy Co., nor its general contractors at the Japanese company CTSD, nor even the subcontractors that had been brought in, had shown any willingness to set up any system or process for looking into the health of their own workers, including the vast majority who had come from outside Sakhalin Island to do the building work.</p> <p>Now, the future operation of the LNG plant also carries with it the threat of many serious accidents (the recent disaster at an LNG plant in Algeria shows how a large explosion can cause a very serious fire). Both the physicians and the local government agencies here have already approached the CTSD Ltd. Co. with the proposal that they take into account the possibility that there might be a large number of casualties, should there be a serious accident at the plant. They proposed to the company that a special evacuation program be set up to deal with these potential casualties. That way, medical help could reach them quickly, and the patients could be placed in the medical facilities here without delay. However, even this proposal for cooperation was to be ignored by the builders of the plant.</p> <p>And now the situation is becoming even less fortuitous, since Sakhalin Energy decided to lay one of its oil pipelines right through a small watershed where water is collected [for the city reservoir]. This has ruined the topsoil near the rivers and streams here, especially in some of the steeper parts of the watershed, leading to a lot of soil runoff and sediment pollution in the reservoirs that serve as the source of public water. The local authorities were even forced to stop using them. Local experts now predict that ".....Korsakov might be without water for the entire winter." In sum, the appearance of 1,500 new residents in the town who are working on the plant has really caused a sharp increase in the demand for water--while, on the other hand, the oil pipeline that was laid by Sakhalin II has put two of the reservoirs out of commission, removing about 40% of all the water that once was used on a daily basis by the town.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

759 (1 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 2)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The sanitation system here, which also has not been repaired or updated for more than ten years, really cannot manage to treat the waste waters that come from Korsakov at this point. As a result, a very significant amount of untreated water is now being dumped into the sea here. Moreover, the growth in local population did not bring in any improvements in the treatment facilities. For the last year, Sakhalin Energy has been sending its waste waters from the LNG plant site to the existing treatment centre for Korsakov. And once they had managed to overload this system, they began to send their waste waters to the treatment plants in the neighbouring villages of Dachnoe and Solovyovka, where the local systems are extremely old and close to a complete and dangerous breakdown. This method of dealing with the problem continued right up to October 2004, that is, until a new treatment centre began to take on the waste waters in the new village that was set up for the construction workers in Prigorod.</p> <p>One should note that the construction workers who were brought here hail from many different countries, such as Turkey, Pakistan, Kirgizia, Uzbekistan, Moldova, Ukraine, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, as well as from many other cities from all over Russia. They brought with them their own diseases and infections, including more than a few venereal cases. There are a number of rather exotic illnesses that have appeared here. The local Korsakov physicians have no experience [with these] and are not sure how to treat them. Already there are cases of AIDs. There are also a number of new cases of tuberculosis and pediculosis [lice]. Official statistics show that, in the time immediately after construction of the LNG plant began, the number of people in the town suffering from pneumonia rose precipitously. And this is not your run-of-the-mill type of pneumonia. What is really unusual is that local people are coming down with pneumonia year-round now, and not just during the short season that once was the rule.</p> <p>For the most part, the construction workers at the plant have no medical coverage at all. And despite all their efforts, the medical teams already serving Korsakov have not been able to force the contractors at the plant to cover the medical costs for those suffering from venereal diseases or AIDs, as is required by Russian law. And insofar as some 1,500 workers have been living in and around the town of Korsakov for over a year now (and many still live there now), one way or another there has been no end of contact with the local residents. This has led to the spread of many diseases and to a growing overload for the hospital here, which had a hard enough time taking care of the existing health problems for the local people before.</p> <p>The problem here really comes down to the fact that a very large number of the workers here have no medical policies. Correspondingly, the people who are employing them have not been paying for any of the medical services that are provided by the local health care system. In the vast majority of cases, the Korsakov medical teams have been forced to render services for free to all the workers at the LNG plant-- not only in cases of severe illnesses but also in cases where ambulance services were required. This has meant ultimately that the local people have had to pay for these services, since every one of them is covered by their own local employers, who pay fees for the public medical insurance policies that support the local health care budget, which in turn goes to pay for all medical services in the region.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.</p> <p>A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan that will include an infection control policy aligned with the Northern Health's Infection Control Plan Best Management Guide for Industrial Camps</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
759 (2 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 2)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>A good example of what is happening is an incident that took place at the beginning of 2004 in the Korsakov hospital. A plant worker was brought in after he had gotten into a drunken brawl and injured his eye. As it turned out, the hospital had to spend the equivalent of 120 thousand rubles [about USD \$4,275] on his treatment. For three months the doctors requested that his employers pay for the treatment. But, in the end, the company refused to pay anything.</p> <p>This is not an unusual case at all: there are many such incidents to cite. This is a town where an LNG plant is being built, where around 5,000 people now live-- and there is only one small health care center that can provide primary care. In other words, we aren't talking here about a place with large-scale medical facilities. What this all means is that any serious outbreak or other health problems among the workers could easily become a tremendous burden upon the Korsakov medical staff. By Russian standards, a town with around 5,000 people should have a functioning hospital with several dozen doctors, each with their own specialization. There should be high-tech equipment available, with in-patient facilities that can house a few dozen patients at least.</p> <p>Another incident happened in March of this year, when there was a case of massive poisoning at one of the larger subcontracting groups, known as the Amur Tiger Company. Some twenty-five people were brought into the Korsakov county hospital with a diagnosis of severe food poisoning. After research into the matter by the state public health officials, the cause of the poisoning became obvious. There had been numerous and severe violations of public health standards in the place where food was being prepared for the company workers. Many of the food products given to the workers had "use-by" dates that had long since past. And the food preparers themselves had not been subject to any kind of inspection, medical or otherwise. (In one case the chief cook was found to have a severe infection on his hand, with pus oozing out.) The foodstuffs were being stored in non-refrigerated areas, and food that had not been consumed the day before was simply served again the next day, etc.</p> <p>The office of the mayor of Korsakov estimates that the treatment alone for all those who came down with food poisoning would cost the county the equivalent of 15% of all the taxes and land-rental fees that the various LNG companies had paid into public coffers during the previous year.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Korsakov medical teams tried to contact the companies that had been contracted to build the plant. However, by May of 2004, when the construction had already been going on for nine months, with a total of 2,000 workers taking part-- none of the companies at hand, neither the Sakhalin Energy Co., nor its general contractors at the Japanese company CTSD, nor even the subcontractors that had been brought in, had shown any willingness to set up any system or process for looking into the health of their own workers, including the vast majority who had come from outside Sakhalin Island to do the building work.</p> <p>Now, the future operation of the LNG plant also carries with it the threat of many serious accidents (the recent disaster at an LNG plant in Algeria shows how a large explosion can cause a very serious fire). Both the physicians and the local government agencies here have already approached the CTSD Ltd. Co. with the proposal that they take into account the possibility that there might be a large number of casualties, should there be a serious accident at the plant. They proposed to the company that a special evacuation program be set up to deal with these potential casualties. That way, medical help could reach them quickly, and the patients could be placed in the medical facilities here without delay. However, even this proposal for cooperation was to be ignored by the builders of the plant.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

759 (3 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 2)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Then, at the beginning of 2004, there was a bad automobile accident at the construction site. There were nine workers who were brought into the Korsakov hospital, with various traumas. This was just too large a number of people for them to be treated at one time. This means that, if the number of injured from some future accident runs into the tens or twenties, there simply is little chance for the Korsakov medical establishment to be able to deal with this on its own. That's why it is necessary to set up some reasonable response regime to deal with a possible large-scale accident in advance.</p> <p>When a large portion of the work force had been living in the town itself, the living conditions that they experienced could hardly be called either civilized or humane. The various large and small sub-contracting companies-- most of whom came from off the island-- decided to place their workers in whatever sort of living quarters were available, at least to begin with. Sometimes the most unpractical living areas were provided-- one example is where they set up a number of beds in the open workshops located in the first buildings erected for the plant. They were reduced to setting apart the living area by hanging fishing nets.</p> <p>In a few cases the number of workers living in one room of this sort reached as many as a hundred. There would be only one washing machine to serve all of them, two toilets and only one shower. Each worker was given an iron cot that was only 2.5 feet wide, with a top and bottom bunk, one mattress per worker, with one set of sheets that was supposed to last them several months at a time. There was no dryer in sight, or any way to dry the clothes and the linens that needed to be washed. And since these workers were working round the clock, they could go weeks without being able to dry any of their wash. And rainy days didn't see any letup in the work either. The workers weren't able to work or live in anything approaching decent conditions. Even now the typical working period for most of the contracting companies goes from ten to fourteen hours a day, with only one or two days off each month. This despite the fact that-- during the negotiations that allowed Sakhalin Energy to build this plant in the first place-- the company was to promise that, from the very beginning of any construction work at the plant, they would first build a so-called "pioneer" [camp] village for the 1,500 workers that would be brought there. This promise turned out to be an empty one, and the construction of the plant went on simultaneously with the construction of possible living quarters for the workers.</p> <p>The main reason that the contracting companies are bringing in so many workers from the mainland, by the way, especially from the former Soviet republics, is that they are doing everything they can to save money on salaries. In many cases they promise wages as high as \$1,000 a month; but they never offer the worker a contract to sign. To get the hired workers to believe in these promises and come to Sakhalin in the first place, they usually give them an immediate advance of \$1,500. But then it turns out that they have to work under very difficult conditions, for up to nine months or more, not earning any extra money while they pay back the advance. Many (about 1/3 of the imported workers) can't hold out, and return home, not having received any real salary during their stay. A lot of them are forced to leave because of some illness or injury that occurs here, insofar as the contracting companies are mostly not paying for any medical treatment.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
760 (1 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The workers that come from the other former Soviet countries are willing to work for very low wages. They are now on foreign soil, and are not familiar with the local laws. They have no way of defending their own workers' rights. For this reason it is quite easy to force them to work in the most difficult conditions, and pay them next to nothing for doing so. They are really fed and paid almost nothing. Workers from Sakhalin have the ability to hire a lawyer, and many of them are members of local unions. As locals, they know their own laws better, and they know that it's possible to go to the local attorney general's offices or go to the labor boards to protect their own rights. That's why it would have been much more challenging to deceive any workers who were locally based, and to force them to work for less money without adhering to any standard of working conditions.</p> <p>So, the contracting companies here don't find it profitable to hire the local Sakhalin workers. For one thing, they would have to pay them more, plus it would be harder to manipulate them to make them work for longer hours than what is allowed by law. The Korsakov labor center statistics show that, during the last year-- out of the 4,500 local Sakhalin people who applied for a job by sending in their resumes to the companies building the plant-- only 172 of them have been hired.</p> <p>A good many of the workers who came to work at the construction site in the fall of 2003 only received their first real wages at the end of June 2004; they only got paid then because of a visit paid by representatives from the EBRD, the US Ex-Im Bank, and the JBIC folks. During the meetings between these representatives and the local population of Korsakov, the problem of nonpayment of wages became clear to everyone. As a result there were a number of pointed comments made by these banking institutions to Sakhalin Energy. Before that, the workers were only fed, and, from time to time, they were given mere advances of only 2-3 thousand rubles [about USD \$70- \$100] for a month. The complete data on how much workers are actually getting paid has been held under very tight wraps. But because of investigations that were conducted by several Sakhalin journalists, it was learned that workers at the LNG construction site on average earn between 8 and 18 thousand rubles [about USD \$285-\$640] a month for non-stop 12-14 hour days. The earnings of workers from the former Soviet republics very rarely reaches 10 thousand rubles [about USD \$360] a month; but this money is extremely hard for them to get their hands on, when it comes down to it.</p> <p>The fact that no plan was made to handle all the additional heavy-vehicle traffic around the construction site has also caused a huge set of problems for the residents of Korsakov.</p> <p>The town of Korsakov and all the fishing villages within Korsakov Region are connected by one dirt road that runs mostly along the shores of Aniva Bay. The LNG plant-- in Prigorod-- will be between these fishing villages and the town itself, which is about 12 kilometers away. There are thousands of people who use this road constantly. What's more, there are several villages and hundreds of dacha complexes [groups of small private cottages with subsistence gardens] that are situated along the road to the plant. A great number of the Korsakov locals, as well as many residents of the larger southern Sakhalin area, use this road to go out into the country to fish, hunt, gather wild mushrooms and berries, or simply to take a holiday on the sea. It is this very stretch of road between Korsakov and Prigorod that has come under the heaviest use by the huge construction trucks that pass by in the thousands.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.</p> <p>A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>

760 (2 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>One recalls how the Sakhalin Energy people made many promises during the negotiation and contract-signing stages of work here. They managed to tell the Korsakov county agencies, and the townspeople as well, that the main cargo loads destined for the construction site would be arrive via sea routes, and not land routes. They said that only during the very early stages, while they were building a special dock for unloading, would a small portion of the heavy loads be sent through the existing port of Korsakov-- and from there, through the town itself. However, today, after a full sixteen months of construction work, as many as 90% of the cargo loads that go to the site are arriving via the main streets of the heart of Korsakov itself. They barrel past the public schools and through residential areas. Then they head out along the Korsakov-Prigorod road, which still does not have any asphalt.</p> <p>The promises made by Sakhalin Energy obviously have been impossible to fulfill, since even if the special loading docks had been built and put into use, this would take only a small portion of the truck traffic off the road. The largest part of the truckloads coming to the site are carrying building materials-- sand, gravel, and other quarried rocks for building. And these would not come through the port anyway, because they come from the island itself. There is no difference whether the loading dock in Prigorod is put to use or not. It really has no effect on how the building materials will be brought in. Most of the materials arrive from the mine and quarry sites located a few dozen kilometres north of Korsakov. From these sites there are only two possible routes of transportation:</p> <p>1. The somewhat longer route, that goes right through the center of Korsakov. The main advantage of this for the truckers is that almost the entire route is well-paved, it being the main road to the southern tip of the island; 2. The main shortcut, which goes entirely along a dirt road, past the small village of Chapaevo. The main drawback to this route is that it is a dirt road that has been used for many years, and really is not appropriate for such heavy traffic, since it has always been in need of constant repair.</p> <p>For the most part, the people who are building the plant prefer that the first route [through the town center]. It is, after all, the one that costs the least (there's no need to constantly repair the road, for example). But late last year, and even early in 2004, the other alternative was also used rather actively, as it is even today, since the dirt road has not completely been broken up into ruts and ravines. Both of these routes entail transport across a 12 kilometer section of dirt road that lies between Korsakov and Prigorod. It is only the second route [via Chapaevo] that does not bring truck traffic into the town of Korsakov itself, since it meets with the connecting road on the outskirts.</p> <p>Sakhalin Energy was supposed to put forward a detailed plan for handling traffic before any work was to have started at the site. They were supposed to have taken these plans and presented them for approval by the county and Sakhalin Province authorities. It is interesting that the company spent several years previous discussing this very problem at various gatherings-- at which they gave a number of different promises, at times contradictory to each other. Yet, no plan of any kind for handling the transportation operations around the construction site was ever committed to paper. And no documents exist to show any work to this effect. Without a doubt, it would be in the interests of the region and the province to have the second [Chapaevo] route used for supplying building materials, requiring that capital improvements be made to this dirt road, to the point where it would be made to detour around the village of Chapaevo as well.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
760 (3 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The authorities in Korsakov have tried to receive more information on the scale and nature of the truck traffic that travels the roads of their region. They want to be able to estimate the total load, and determine what measures should be taken to strengthen and improve the roads that are being used. But neither Sakhalin Energy, nor CTSD, nor any of the other subcontractors have given any response to the questions that have been posed to them on this subject. Only one of the contracting firms has managed to reply that, during the first year of construction, it was gauged that some 40,000 cubic meters of sand and about 60,000 cubic meters of crushed rock had been trucked across the Korsakov roads (for a total of about 180,000 metric tons transported).</p> <p>At the time that construction started at the site, there had not been any signs of new road-building, and no efforts had been made at road improvement at all (with the exception of a few streets within Korsakov itself). The construction of the plant went on using the existing system of roads in situ. There had been absolutely no accounting for what the sharp increase in traffic would do.</p> <p>So, with the increasingly intensive use of the roads, by the spring of 2004 it turned out that many sections of road were simply in ruins. The Sakhalin climate is quite damp. In springtime, during the thawing of the snows, a massive amount of water floods the land. Traffic along the dirt roads at this time (from March to June) is bound to have the most ruinous effect. This is why for many years the province authorities have only allowed a limited amount of heavy freight truck traffic along the dirt roads of the island. In essence, they allow heavy truck traffic during this time of impassable roads only by a system of special permits. However, as of the spring of 2004, the LNG plant builders had still been able to completely ignore these longstanding restrictions. Consequently, the dirt roads here, especially the Korsakov-Prigorod portion, were completely broken up and ruined.</p> <p>The local traffic of privately-owned cars between Korsakov and the fishing villages of Ozerski, Beregovoe, and Novikovo, all along the Aniva Bay, was almost completely shut down during this period because of the state of the road. The enormous trucks had left such deep ruts in the road to the [LNG] plant that even an all-terrain jeep would have had trouble getting through. The detour towards the building site, which should have led traffic up to the site as early as the beginning of 2004, was still not open for operation (it only opened in the month of October, 2004). From the start of March right through April it was very difficult to supply locals with food or with any postal mail. Locals simply couldn't reach the central hospital either (there were even incidents where the ambulances got stuck in the awful roads here). No one could go out into the countryside at all; not even to visit relatives.</p> <p>And so, in order to force Sakhalin Energy, and CTSD and the other subcontractors to do some repairs on the road, the local Korsakov officials held a "round table" for everyone to discuss the problem. However, not one of the companies responsible for building the plant sent any representatives to this meeting.</p> <p>That's when the mayor called for the local citizens to get out and picket the road in the region around Prigorod. They did manage to stop truck traffic in its tracks for several hours. But even with this, no representatives from Sakhalin Energy or from CTSD were willing to come forward into a dialogue with the local residents and their elected officials. It was only after the local press started writing about the alarming situation that the province-level officials started to exert some pressure on both companies-- at which time they started to take some action to repair the road.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

760 (4 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The same situation arose around the road running through Chapaevov. This road was at first used for transporting sand and hard rock materials. The heavy loads that came through eventually completely destroyed the road, leaving the local residents totally isolated from the outside world. One could pass over this road only in trucks with very high undercarriage clearance. It was here that the locals were able to force some repairs of the road, but only by setting up pickets and blocking trucks from passing. More than a few residents of the larger Korsakov region were forced to repair their cars after the beating they took from driving across these terrible roads. CTSD and Sakhalin Energy had agreed to pay USD \$2 million to the Korsakov County coffers, of which three-hundred thousand was supposed to cover or compensate for the needed repair and rebuilding of roads here. However, by the estimate of independent experts, it would take no less than USD \$7 million to give full compensation for all the damage and other negative impacts to the roads and road traffic of the region (which itself does not include all the losses incurred by local businesses and by private people as they went about their business).</p> <p>The town residents are having trouble dealing with the truck traffic.</p> <p>Before the construction at the site started, Sakhalin Energy and CTSD had agreed to widen and otherwise improve the thoroughfares, so as to provide for truck transport along the streets of Korsakov. However, they managed to do this by getting rid of the sidewalks for pedestrians. As a result, pedestrians in the town are now in a lot more danger. Already one of the town's residents walking along the truck routes through the center was hit by a bus that was carrying workers to the LNG plant. Her suit is now in court.</p> <p>The truck routes here pass through a number of residential areas. In some cases the road with all these trucks runs only a matter of 10-15 meters from the front doors of these houses. This causes a lot of inconvenience for the locals, mostly from the incessant noise, and the dust and dirt that is kicked up. For the first few months of construction the trucks were roaring by even at night. There are houses here which shake strongly with the passing of each truck, rattling the dishes, shaking everything. The air quality has gotten a great deal worse along the truck routes, mostly from the exhaust that comes from each truck. Also, the middle school in Korsakov has suffered some impact, since truck traffic streams right past it. In front of the school are two of the most dangerous intersections in town. Now each student has to have a teacher accompany him or her to cross the street both before and after school. And the classrooms have become incredibly stuffy and uncomfortable, since the windows have to be closed at all times to keep out the dust and air pollution that can even make it impossible for the kids to breathe.</p> <p>The kids themselves decided to start monitoring all the truck traffic in front of their school, and found that each school day some 150 trucks passed by en route to the LNG plant site (this did not include other trucks or other heavy traffic). There's a stoplight right in front of the school, which means that many trucks just stand there idling, with traffic often backing up. So as to avoid this backup, the trucks from the LNG plant often drive right across the square that is in front of the school, even during the time in between classes when the kids are out on the street. This still happens all the time, forcing the school administration to erect a concrete barrier in front of the school.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
760 (5 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In the spring of 2004, when the roads were blocked up with the thawing snows, the trucks that came through town began to track an immense amount of dirt and mud into town. The streets in town were covered in layers of mud. When they dried in summer, they turned into massive dirt and dust piles. The city officials in charge of the roads in Korsakov tried to force the drivers and their bosses to start cleaning their trucks-- but nothing came of it. When the local police inspectors started to fine the drivers as they passed through town, the drivers just turned around and washed their trucks in some of the spawning streams near town. There has been no plan put forward to set up a truck wash at the plant.</p> <p>Before all this started, the sight of a heavy truck on any of Korsakov's streets was a rare thing indeed. The local people had no idea that all the construction going on over there in Prigorod would bring them so much trouble.</p> <p>The builders of the LNG plant are ignoring all the requirements set down by law concerning compensation for polluting the environment.</p> <p>In accordance with the federal law on "Protecting the Environment", every business enterprise that might cause pollutants to enter the atmosphere during operations, or that contaminates the water or soil around it, must set aside a special fee to pay for having caused this pollution, a payment which goes to the federal, regional, and local state budgets. The greater the volume of pollution, the larger the payment to be made. This standard of operation pertains even to the use of private automobiles.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the business contractors at hand here-- such as: BAM Mechanical Construction, Far East Mechanical Construction, Rosneft Resources, Moscow Electrical Line Construction, Tiger Amur, and Angarsk Construction Management-- not to mention the Japanese CTSD Corporation and IKEM-- all have been conducting work here without making a single payment of this nature. The State Environmental Inspectors have checked into this a number of times, and have each time revealed a complete absence of any documentation that would allow these companies to use the natural resources here (these documents should be set up to show the limits to the amount of waste that can be produced at the site, or how this waste must be handled; it also sets limits to the amount of pollution that may be released into the atmosphere, as well as how much in the way of other pollution may be allowed in the local natural environment).</p> <p>This all means that the companies are getting away without taking care of any fines or other payments for polluting the environment here. Thanks to this trickery, the plant builders here have been able to save a ton of money, while the state budget coffers at all levels are not getting their fair share of payments. Even today, after a number of attempts at sanctioning these companies, a few of them are still avoiding payment, and have yet to submit the appropriate licensing documents that would set them up to pay compensation for the pollution they release.</p> <p>The Korsakov residents are also losing one of the best beach sites in the region, with very little in the way of compensation proposed-- thanks to the construction of this LNG plant.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

760 (6 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>At the very site where the plant is being built, there is a fine sandy beach that has been popular for many years among the local residents. This beach once provided all kinds of valuable opportunities for enjoyment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is here that one can both swim and sunbathe for a good part of the warm season. In fact, this is about the only place in the Korsakov region that is suitable for swimming, since nearer to the town itself the water has been seriously polluted by other industries and by the release of municipal wastes. Many of the poorer children who couldn't be sent to camps by their parents would often spend most of their summers on this one good beach.</li> <li>• In addition, this beach is noted for some of the best sport fishing in the region, with a number of species of salmon and others to be caught here.</li> <li>• One type of salmon uses tidepools here to spawn, after which many local people would gather the mature fish in buckets.</li> <li>• After good storms, the local people would also be able to go out and gather a number of shell fish, which would have washed up on shore.</li> <li>• There are also small groups of fishermen who are licensed to catch the salmon here, coming in from all over southern Sakhalin.</li> </ul> <p>In sum, the significance of this beach to the tens of thousands of local residents who use it would be hard to overestimate.</p> <p>The beach itself occupies a strip of shoreline that is about 2,400 meters long (about 1.5 miles). Of this amount, some 800 meters was set aside for the plant itself, just to the east of mouth of the Meroy River. This area is already out-of-bounds for local residents. Along this stretch of beach a protected dock is being built, for offloading equipment. Another dock is being built here for shipping cargo, alongside the fuel pipeline that will run out into the sea to a special offshore facility for exports.</p> <p>The CTSD and Sakhalin Energy companies came up with an assessed value for these 800 meters of beach that amounted to USD \$800,000-- which comes to \$1,000 per meter of beachfront property. The beach here averages about 15 meters in width, so the price put on this land was about \$1,000 per 15 square meters. How this compensatory sum was reached, and whose imagination was used to reach it, is a mystery to us all. This money has already been handed over to the town, although it quickly became evident that this would somehow not really compensate for the loss of the beach. You couldn't even use this money to build a decent swimming pool in the town, which has been a dream of the local residents for years. It wouldn't be enough to pay for rebuilding the bridges that lead across the Aniva inlet to some of the other similar beaches that are recreational favorites of the people from southern Sakhalin. You wouldn't have enough money either to build up a new beach to the north of town, where the water is fairly polluted anyway. For this reason, it was decided to use the money to rebuild the city park. But even here, once work on this began, it became quite clear that this money would only go as far as paying for the design and other digging and preparatory work for the park.</p> <p>Sakhalin Energy had promised to leave the remaining 1,600 meters of beach untouched for use by the local population. It was stated over and over again, in no uncertain terms (including in all the planning documents for construction) that this beach would not be affected by the construction work here, and that people could continue to enjoy fishing and other recreational activities here. But, as it turned out, the so-called "public health zone " around the plant is now slated to stretch out some 3.5 kilometres. And this means that the entire beach will be encompassed within the overall territory of the plant.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
760 (7 of 7)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia (part 3)	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>By the current laws in Russia concerning the protection of public health, these off-limit zones cannot allow for the construction of any hazardous industries in an area also used for public recreation. This means that the folks at Prigorod cannot be allowed to use this beach at all. What's more, CTSD Ltd. has already prepared a project to build up a road here that will run right along the beachfront. They know that the strong ocean currents could be a problem. So, as part of their project plans, the company intends to build a rock barrier right along the beach, between the road and the high tide level of the beach. There's no doubt that this kind of barrier will result in the disappearance of the beach itself. Nevertheless, not a word has been spoken about how the town might be compensated for the loss of the remaining 1,600 meters of beachfront property.</p> <p>This is but a spare list of all the problems that are emerging here, thanks to the construction of this now controversial LNG plant. We have said nothing here about the larger environmental impacts on the fisheries here, by the way. Nor do we mention the arrogant and offensive manner in which the managers of these Western companies have been treating the Russian workers at the site. There's also the matter of how the Sakhalin newspapers have been all bought off by Sakhalin Energy, so that for a certain amount of money they are willing to print only the most positive materials about the construction of the plant here. And how about how so many of the small farmers and dacha owners who have been forced off their land? Or the crime wave that has hit the region around the construction site itself?</p> <p>There is much that remains hidden from our view as well, since Sakhalin Energy seems to like to operate "behind closed doors" at all times. They have a very strict regime for controlling all the information they hold. They keep a tight air of secretiveness in any case where there might be a hint of negative news about their operations. They show no tolerance for any kind of criticism at all either. But, because of all these problems that we've begun to list here, the local people are starting to look at the LNG plant with more and more antipathy and aggression."</p> <p>So, I know that many might read this and say: well, this is Canada, not Russia. This won't happen here. But as already noted, the Canadian government itself has requested information from the Chinese National Offshore Oil Company in regards to the proposed Aurora LNG project - and it has so far yet to materialize. Data from the impact of LNG terminals on communities in other areas of the world could be analyzed to come up with a more accurate prediction of the impact that will be felt here, but neither the Canadian government or CNOOC-Nexen seem to care to do that.</p> <p>The complete disregard for Canadian citizens' wellbeing, and for Canadian towns and communities - leads me to believe that many of the issues written about Russia and the problems locals felt from an LNG terminal being built, will also become the issues that we will feel here in Canada. This project should not even be at the FINAL public comment period, since baseline data has not been accurately done, and there is missing data that has been asked for.</p> <p>I urge the BCEAO to read reports from other LNG terminals and effects that they have had on local populations - and refuse to allow this public comment period to continue. The Aurora project has not treated this project as serious - but has tried to present a position that this will have a minimum impact on local residents, and that they will have "plans" in place to deal with any likely negative scenario. Yet those negative scenarios are not being fully looked. Not to worry, someone somewhere at sometime will see these plans. Not the current working group, not the BCEAO. Not the public, not the local residents, not BEFORE the approval of this project.</p>	

761 (1 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Since Aurora LNG final application has failed to look at accidents or malfunctions from terrorism, here are some clear statements. Everyone considers Canada to be low-risk for terrorism, but in today's very uncertain global political field and changing pressures it cannot be completely discounted. There are very real concerns in many countries that have suffered terrorist attacks, such as the U.S., and LNG terminals such as Yemen have suffered a number of terrorist attacks on its 350 km feed-gas pipeline as well as a rocket attack on its LNG export terminal, and other alarming potential attacks by boats. The point of assessing an LNG terminal is to assess ALL possible effects that it could have on the surrounding communities and environment. Would placing an LNG terminal close to population and airport increase the risk of terrorist attacks to the residents living here? What additional security would be put in place regarding that potential? How will the existing marine traffic be affected by additional security? How would local residents be affected by additional security? Nexen's Aurora LNG newsletter pointed out that LNG comes into Boston Harbour safely, close to populations, as well that has been verbally said by Nexen employees. But the fact is that Boston Harbour is virtually shut down while an LNG ship approaches, and multiple security measures are taken that have not even been discussed here or in this application. So it is not an accurate comparison.</p> <p>"Every day you're thinking about it. It's very, very dangerous," Anthony Pinto, of East Boston, said as pointed his cane across the harbor, down the Mystic River, past the Tobin Bridge to the dock for Distrigas, the company that runs the area's LNG facility. Some studies say an attack by a missile or boat bomb on a tanker could spill half the cargo over the water, causing a catastrophic, searingly hot fire that would burn people and buildings a half-mile away. But a study paid for by the industry and used by the Coast Guard in approving a safety plan for Boston found the burn zone would be contained to a much smaller area. U.S. Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham has asked Sandia National Laboratory to study LNG safety issues, particularly transportation. James Fay, a professor emeritus of mechanical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is a leading expert on liquefied natural gas and former chairman of the Massachusetts Port Authority board. He believes a boat bomb, like the one used against the USS Cole in 2000 would cause at least half of the ship's cargo to seep over the water and ignite in a raging blaze. "There's no doubt that with a big enough bomb you can blow a hole in the side of the vessel and the cargo will burn," Fay said. "It's well understood that for the big fires we're talking about that distances like half a mile or so, you can get second-degree burns to exposed skin in about 30 seconds." Jerry Havens, a University of Arkansas professor and expert in both fires and weapons of mass destruction, said he agrees with Fay's assessments. Both he and Fay recognize LNG as a valuable resource — but one with risks.</p> <p><a href="http://www.nbcnews.com/id/4276348/ns/us_news-security/t/are-natural-gas-ships-boat-bombs-terror/#.WK8clmizVI">http://www.nbcnews.com/id/4276348/ns/us_news-security/t/are-natural-gas-ships-boat-bombs-terror/#.WK8clmizVI</a></p> <p>Boston Harbour Security measures are strict, shut down marine traffic, cost up to \$25,000 each shipment, and is obviously of a very different nature than what is being proposed here, by Aurora LNG, at the entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour, within a disastrously close distance to Dodge Cove, Prince Rupert, the airport, Maher Terminals, Ridley Island Grain and Coal (and soon to be Propane), yet it seems that there has failed to be a real analysis of potential hazards/accidents/malfunctions/terrorist attacks/additional security measures and what those will mean to residents living here. If any of these security measures are to be taken, what cost to taxpayers will come with that? How will the present traffic in and out of the harbour be affected, how will traditional activities by boat and on land be affected, how will recreational activities be affected?</p> <p>These concerns of transiting dangerous cargo of this size that could potentially wipe out everything around it have led to (unsuccessful) attempts by the mayor of Boston to permanently suspend LNG shipments to the Everett terminal passing through Boston harbor.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
761 (2 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>"All crew members have U.S. visas, and access to the ship is closely controlled, with visitors escorted. Security teams accompany the ship. Bomb-sniffing dogs inspect the ships and divers conduct bottom surveys during the transit. Follow-up inspections are conducted upon arrival at Boston, and security teams come aboard to inspect and escort, and special teams monitor the critical watch stations.</p> <p>"If we note any anomalies at any time from departure to transit to arrival without determining if the anomaly can be investigated and cleared, we won't permit the ship to enter this port," said Morkan. On the water, a security zone surrounds the ships, enforced by as many as a dozen response boats from the different agencies to keep other craft away from the tanker, along with one or more helicopters. Airport movements are coordinated, and the Tobin Bridge is closed when the ship passes under.</p> <p>As noted earlier in this report, the LNG safety provisions in the Pipeline Safety Act require the Secretary of Transportation to "consider the ... need to encourage remote siting" of new LNG facilities. If terrorists caused even 10 percent of the typical LNG tanker's payload to spill and ignite, the resulting fire could be calamitous, according to a 2004 report by Sandia National Laboratories for the U.S. Department of Energy. The study didn't publicly estimate casualties for Boston; in fact, no study has since 1977. It's not hard to imagine why Boston remains the country's only major city with an LNG terminal. The tankers were such cause for concern after 9/11, Mayor Thomas Menino asked a federal judge to ban them from the city. "This is serious stuff," Menino says. "We don't have the equipment to put down an explosion of an LNG tank. They say, 'Well, it will never happen.' Well, 9/11 hadn't happened either. We live in a different era."</p> <p>Shouldn't the 1977 risk-assessment study be updated?</p> <p>Yes. Boston Deputy Fire Chief Jay Fleming has been agitating for this type of update for years. Menino says the Department of Homeland Security in February promised him an assessment of how to get LNG out of the harbor, but has yet to deliver a report. The DHS declined to comment.</p> <p>How would the city respond to an LNG fire?</p> <p>The worst kind of fire would be an event so large and unprecedented, it's near impossible to prepare for. The Massachusetts Firefighting Academy in Stow has an LNG training program, but it focuses on fighting fires from smaller-scale leaks, such as from pipelines or transport trucks. Pool fires (see page 91) are just too big. "We're not training for that type of an incident," says State Fire Marshal Stephen Coan, "and I don't think that you can train for that type of an incident" on a large scale. Still, Boston city officials, Distrigas, and the Coast Guard say they regularly collaborate on joint emergency drills.</p> <p>What does Menino want?</p> <p>The mayor wants tankers to stop coming, which would happen only if the region found other ways to get natural gas: via offshore facilities, for instance, or more pipeline, says Donald McGough, director of the city's Office of Emergency Preparedness. City officials have said each shipment costs \$25,000 in public-safety measures.</p> <p>THE ROUTE</p> <p>Every LNG tanker cruises past the piers and bridges of downtown and Charlestown before docking in Everett. Here are some of the security measures taken along the way:</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	



761 (3 of 3)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Four days out The LNG tanker is required to alert the Coast Guard of its approach and provide a manifest. The Coast Guard runs background checks on the crew. (Distrigas performs its own background checks before its ships sail.) The tanker must contact the Coast Guard again at 48, 24, 12, and 5 hours outside Boston Harbor.</p> <p>Six to twelve miles out Two Coast Guard officers board the tanker for safety checks and to watch for vessels that get within 500 yards. The Coast Guard also sends in teams of 12 to 24 officers for random security sweeps, though they're more likely to spot check ships from Yemen.</p> <p>Five miles out A member of the Boston Harbor Pilot Association meets and boards the tanker. After safety and information protocols are performed, the pilot directs the ship toward the harbor at about 10 knots, or 12 miles per hour.</p> <p>Entering Boston Harbor When the ship enters the North Channel, that's the point of no return. Until then, the harbor pilot can decide to stop, no questions asked. From here, though, the pilot has committed. As the ship passes through the harbor, it hugs the East Boston shoreline, where the channel is deeper. The Coast Guard allows LNG tankers to enter only on clear days.</p> <p>Pleasure Bay As the ship slows, four tugboats lash themselves to its sides. (The tugs can haul the tanker and help it maneuver in case of emergency.) Here, the tanker enters the security zone, and law enforcement appears. No unauthorized vessels are allowed within 500 yards. At least five small boats — the Coast Guard, city and state police, and Massachusetts Environmental Police among them — escort the tanker. One or more choppers hovers above.</p> <p><a href="http://www.bostonmagazine.com/2010/06/safe-harbor/">http://www.bostonmagazine.com/2010/06/safe-harbor/</a> <a href="http://www.defensemedianetwork.com/stories/u-s-coast-guard-counterering-maritime-security-risk/">http://www.defensemedianetwork.com/stories/u-s-coast-guard-counterering-maritime-security-risk/</a></p>	
762	2017-02-23	Bob George	<p>Dear EAO, I believe our coast to be one of the most amazing areas of the planet, and our Salmon one of creations most special species. If you risk destroying these precious resources, for some temporary monetary gain through the fossil fuel industry, and your gamble doesn't work out, history will look at our generation as the greedy, selfish pigs that we seem to be. This is YOUR responsibility. It will be ON YOU!</p> <p>Sincerely, Bob George, Kelowna</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
763	2017-02-23	Kraig and Valerie Schweiss	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>We write to you to plead for the Skeena salmon that will invariably be killed by the massive fracked gas plant, Aurora LNG, owned by a Chinese oil company slated to be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island. For the following reasons, we would like to detail why this plant is so WRONG for the area:</p> <p>1) It threatens salmon and wildlife. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to those posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons, and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction, and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat, and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbor porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>2) It threatens community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air, and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96% of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometer from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbor is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels, and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams, and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health, and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should NOT be approved.</p> <p>3) It threatens our climate. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping, and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>We hope that our explanation of the threats to our wildlife,, human health and safety, and our climate will help you to see that building such an imposing structure will severely and permanently damage our ecologically dependent economy upon which we rely for our very survival. We cannot in good conscience let this plant be built here. Thank you for your understanding and compliance with our needs and wishes.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kraig and Valerie Schweiss, Sterling, IL</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
764	2017-02-23	Eileen Floody	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am truly tired of the complete neglect of wild salmon habitat. The protections for ocean habitat are nonexistent at federal or provincial levels. Salmon are the backbone of the coast, as cliché as that may sound. The assaults they face, from salmon farms, industrialization, water pollution, logging malpractice, ports, dredging, and now LNG facilities, and the worst overall, global warming are combining to bring about the extinction of this vital and iconic species. It is way past time to stop the war on nature. No Aurora LNG. And, what really annoys me - "Aurora" - the name for the northern lights and the goddess of dawn. What an insult! This project only brings death, not light and life.</p> <p>Sincerely, Eileen Floody, Tofino</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

765	2017-02-23	Evelyn Ball	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding Nexen;s proposal to build the massive Aurora fracked gas plant near Prince Rupert. It would be right next door to Delusion Bay, which provides critical salmon habitat considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank.</p> <p>Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank by Petronas.</p> <p>This salmon-killing carbon bomb does not belong here.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Evelyn Ball, Lockport</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
766	2017-02-23	kara middleton	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am very concerned that there is a proposal by Nexen Corporation to build a fracked gas plant near the Skeena estuary, which is a critically important salmon breeding habitat, and also an important wetland. Both salmon habitats and wetlands have been disappearing from our coastal areas at alarming rates; and the climate change, environmental, economic and cultural implications are inestimable.</p> <p>Please, do the right thing, and say "no" to this treacherous proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>kara middleton, sooke</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
767	2017-02-23	Lorinda Campbell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lorinda Campbell, Vanderhoof</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
768	2017-02-23	bonnie robinson	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Hello. As a Canadian I am very concerned with the state of our water and our wild fish populations of salmon. I live in the Yukon and have witnessed the decline of salmon for the past 30 years. Very few salmon are making it back to spawn. Right now the Pacific Ocean is in desperate need of protection. You must do all you can to protect wild salmon.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>bonnie robinson, Haines junction</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
769 (1 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>A few excerpts from an article highlighting concerns regarding proximity of LNG terminals/tankers to communities/existing marine tanker zones and questions regarding emergency situations.</p> <p>LNG and Public Safety Issues</p> <p>Summarizing current knowledge about potential worst-case consequences of LNG spills onto water. by JERRY HAVENS Professor, Chemical Engineering, University of Arkansas</p> <p>"However, limiting discussion to the initial results of a terrorist attack is not necessarily sufficient.</p> <p>My year-long look at the LNG vapor dispersion issue for the Coast Guard produced a report<sup>3</sup> in 1978 that reviewed several predictions by leading authorities of the vapor cloud extent, following spillage of 25,000 m<sup>3</sup> LNG onto water. Those estimates ranged from 0.75 mile to a little over 50 miles. The range was narrowed by showing the errors in reasoning underlying the lowest and highest estimates, but the uncertainty range could not be tightened closer than three to 10 miles.</p> <p>First, the use of a thermal flux criterion that would result in second-degree burns in 30 seconds is not necessarily appropriate to ensure public safety, as such exposure essentially ensures that serious burns will occur at that distance to persons who cannot gain shelter within 30 seconds. Aside from questions about the ability of even the most able to gain shelter in such a short time, questions are also raised about the safety of those less able."</p> <p>How would Prince Rupert Hospital, schools, elderly, residences, be evacuated? How would emergency services respond to a major accident/malfunction?</p> <p>From what I have read, no plan has been released publicly to deal with this, and emergency services have been put back onto the Regional District, and Prince Rupert which means many things.</p> <p>A)The taxpayers will be paying for this B)Assuming the emergency responders in Prince Rupert are not physically injured or dead themselves C)That right now there is no experience in dealing with LNG accidents D)There is not adequate emergency services to respond to anything of magnitude</p> <p>In the case of an ignitable vapour cloud, how would residents be evacuated when any spark could ignite it (including static electricity?) How would residents of Digby Island be evacuated (assuming they are not immediately dead) when any way on or off the island needs engines, therefore sparks?</p> <p>"Lower thermal flux criteria (~1.5KW/m<sup>2</sup>) are prescribed in other national and international regulations designed to provide safe separation distances for the public from fires. Since such lower thermal flux level criteria could increase the distances prescribed in the ABS Group and Sandia reports by as much as one and a half to two times, this end point criteria for ensuring public safety from LNG fires should be reconsidered, especially if the goal is to provide for public safety."</p> <p>"However, the Sandia report states that cascading events, resulting either from brittle fracture of structural steel on the ship or failure of the insulation that results in LNG vaporization at rates exceeding the capability of the relief valves, cannot be ruled out.</p> <p>Foamed plastic insulation, widely used on LNG carriers, would be highly susceptible to failure by melting or decomposition. It is a cardinal safety rule that the pressure limits on tanks carrying flammable or reactive materials should not be exceeded, as such excess portends catastrophic rupture of the containment. While the Sandia report concludes that such cascading events would be very unlikely to involve more than three of the five tanks on a typical LNG carrier, the report's optimism in this regard is unexplained.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

769 (2 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Once cascading failures begin, what would stop the process from resulting in the total loss of all LNG aboard the carrier? Other hazards associated with spilling LNG onto water include oxygen deprivation, cold-burns, rapid nphase transitions, and explosions in confined spaces, as well as the potential for unconfined vapor cloud explosions (UVCEs) if the LNG contains significant heavies." Since the Aurora LNG export terminal is proposed for within 500 metres of the center of the main marine channel with large and small scale existing marine traffic travelling through - I am surprised at the lack of description around potential emergencies. The potential effects to the communities of Prince Rupert and Dodge Cove, including residual and cumulative effects if an accident happened, have not been adequately assessed or described. Studies on large scale accidents of this nature have not been adequately done by either government or the oil and gas industry, severe information gaps are letting both make assumptions with human lives. <a href="https://www.hsd1.org/?view&amp;did=685565">https://www.hsd1.org/?view&amp;did=685565</a> I would like to include the following well written article by Graeme Pole that highlights many of the concerns that I have regarding the Aurora LNG proposal. Many of these issues have been glossed over with media propaganda from both the government and the proponent. Many issues raised at open houses, in previous public comments periods, or by letters to the government have been ignored or responded to with such statements as "we understand your concerns". "The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines due diligence as: "The care that a reasonable person exercises to avoid harm to other persons or their property." As the debate on British Columbia's proposed liquefied natural gas (LNG) industry enters its fourth year, it is past time to bring one aspect of that industry under scrutiny – the safety of people in proximity to LNG vessels and terminals. Breaking all the rules The default document on this topic is one created by the LNG industry itself. In 1997, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) published Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties. The document is clear and succinct in describing how to enhance LNG safety: -LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from a spill or release cannot affect civilians. -LNG ship berths must be far from the ship transit fairway to prevent collision, and since all other vessels must be considered an ignition source. -LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses now and into the future. -Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided, due to greater navigation risk. -Waterways containing navigation hazards are to be avoided as LNG ports. Anyone familiar with the marine approaches to Prince Rupert and Kitimat will be aware that to propose marine transport of LNG from terminals in those harbours violates all of the SIGTTO standards referred to above.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
769 (3 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Prince Rupert at Risk Although industry analysts agree that not all will be built, four large terrestrial LNG export facilities are proposed for the Prince Rupert area, along with three, smaller floating facilities. At full build-out, the large plants would generate 796 round-trip transits of LNG vessels into port, the smaller facilities 208. That's almost three round-trips per day. In 2014, the Prince Rupert Port Authority reported that 494 vessels called at port terminals to take on and offload trade resources and goods, and that was a year when coal export was markedly down. A typical LNG tanker – larger than an apartment block Key concerns are not just that LNG export could triple industrial vessel transits at Prince Rupert, and that the BC government sees no harm in promoting that possibility. Vessels in the Q-Max LNG carrier class are 345 metres long with a capacity of 266,000 cubic metres of LNG, comparable in size to the large ships that now dock at the Fairview Container Port. The potential tripling of marine traffic at Prince Rupert would principally involve extremely large vessels carrying a dangerous commodity in a confined waterway. Russian Roulette The likelihood of a breach to one of the five or six storage tanks on a typical LNG vessel – whether accidental or intentional – is low. It has not happened since LNG marine transport began in 1959. But LNG itself as a substance, through its manufacturing process and in its steady-state in storage, possesses innate hazards. LNG terminals and storage facilities have suffered catastrophic explosions. As more vessels are added to LNG fleets, making more voyages into confined and treacherous waters such as found on BC's north coast, the chances of at least an accidental breach in a marine setting will increase. World events of the past two decades indicate that the risk of an intentional breach cannot be dismissed. For the LNG industry to tout past "safe" performance as an absolute indicator of future probability is hubristic. Cold Explosion What would happen if LNG were to escape from a marine vessel storage tank? In 2004 and 2008, the US Department of Energy commissioned Sandia National Laboratories to find out. Sandia reported that an instantaneous fireball would not be likely. What would be more likely is a "cold explosion" known as a rapid phase transition. The temperature of LNG is -161.5°C. Escaping from a vessel, LNG would release a blast as it froze the ocean surface, then evaporate as it warmed and picked up water vapour to form a low, heavier-than-air vapour cloud that would drift outward. The larger the breach, the larger the cloud. Outright ignition of regasified LNG would require it to mix with air in a range of 5 percent to 15 percent LNG. If this cloud of LNG vapour were to spread from a vessel or a terminal with optimal conditions for ignition, an aerial fireball would be possible. That ignition would typically "backtrack" from the spark to the source of the cloud. But with an onshore wind a fiery blanket could disperse over land. Sandia's research suggested that typical aerial dispersal distances from a small breach would be 3050 m from a near-shore source, and 4600 m from an offshore source. Hazard Zones</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

769 (4 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>LNG burns at more than 500°C. Sandia's reports described three zones of hazard around an LNG vessel should a breach occur with ignition. Within 500 metres of the vessel, death to all living things on the water, surfacing from the water, in the air, or on adjacent land would be likely. This could result from shrapnel, incineration, cryogenic freezing or from suffocation. Between 500 metres and 1.6 km from the vessel, these threats lessen but are still critical. Second-degree burns to exposed human flesh would typically result from 30 seconds of exposure.</p> <p>Structural fires, grass fires, and forest fires would be ignited. Effects would lessen moving from 1.6 km out to 3.5 km, beyond which the hazard is considered negligible. In the US, these hazard zones have been embodied in regulations governing LNG facility location. It is also standard for LNG ports to have fireboats that are foam-capable, as use of water on an LNG-fed fire would exacerbate it.</p> <p>Plotting the Sandia hazard zones along the shipping lane at Prince Rupert is informative. All human settlement in Prince Rupert, Port Edward, Dodge Cove, and Seal Cove is within the hazard zones. More than 13,000 residents are at risk, along with up to 3,000 people who may be visiting at any given time. More than 60,000 passengers depart the port on ferries and water taxis each year in these hazard zones.</p> <p>If this information can be gleaned from reliable sources on the Internet (such as Government of Canada and Prince Rupert Port Authority websites), with distances confirmed using Google Earth, be assured that the BC government, federal government, and the LNG industry are aware.</p> <p>In harm's way</p> <p>Fishing fleet at Cow Bay in Prince Rupert LNG vessels transiting to the proposed WCC LNG facility on Tuck Inlet (across Fern Passage from Seal Cove) would ply the length of the Prince Rupert Harbour shipping lane and its approaches. The Fairview Container Terminal is on the verge of the 500-metre hazard zone, as is a 4 km length of the CN Rail line. The Coast Guard base, City Hall and its Emergency Operations Centre, the Fire Hall and its 911 call centre, the Prince Rupert Port Authority with its Port Security Operations Centre and Emergency Operations Centre, the BC Ferries and Alaska Marine Highway terminals, the Via Rail terminal, the Seal Cove Coast Guard Search and Rescue helicopter base and BC Ambulance medevac base, and the RCMP detachment all lie within 1.6 km of that shipping lane. Prince Rupert Regional Hospital and the BC Ambulance station are on the 1.6 km line.</p> <p>To cement brazen disregard for the SIGTTO guidelines, LNG vessels approaching WCC LNG would pass other LNG vessels berthed for loading at the proposed Aurora LNG facility on Digby Island, at a point where the navigable waterway is scarcely 1 km wide. They would also pass LNG vessels docked at New Times LNG and Orca LNG on the Prince Rupert waterfront.</p> <p>Boston-bound LNG ships require armed escort Boston is the only US city with an LNG facility. The Everett terminal in Boston Harbour imports LNG – meaning that vessels enter the harbour loaded and leave empty – the opposite to what is proposed for BC's north coast. Typically, only one LNG vessel every eight days makes the trip to Everett LNG, but the stir that each passage creates is instructive in terms of appraising risk.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
769 (5 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>When four days from port, an LNG vessel approaching Boston must contact the US Coast Guard with a manifest and crew list. The Coast Guard runs checks on the crew. When 12 miles from port, the Coast Guard boards the vessel to inspect it and to begin surveillance to ensure that all other vessels keep 500 yards away. When five miles out, a pilot boards the vessel and four tugboats are engaged. Passage into port is only permitted in daylight and with clear visibility.</p> <p>Five armed boats, two from the Coast Guard and one each from three police agencies, escort the LNG vessel into harbour. Law enforcement officers patrol all piers and jetties along the route, with a helicopter or two dedicated to observe from above. Bridge traffic over the harbour is halted as the vessel makes way beneath. Marinas are shuttered and guarded for 20 minutes before and after each transit. The security cost? About 80,000 USD per transit. The economic cost? Unknown.</p> <p>Tight restrictions on lone Atlantic Canada import port The Port of St. John, New Brunswick, is home to Canaport LNG, Canada's only LNG import facility. Transport Canada has implemented Boston-like measures for LNG transits: mandatory security screening of LNG vessel crews; a "marine safety zone" of 0.5 nautical miles (926 m) around any LNG vessel; no anchoring within 1.5 nautical miles of an LNG vessel; and no overtaking of LNG vessels when they are underway in the harbour.</p> <p>When an LNG vessel is offloading at Canaport LNG, a 620 m radius from the centre of the terminal is off-limits to all marine traffic except tugs and service craft employed with that vessel. Given the large "sail areas" of LNG vessels, the harbour master may consider other "special provisions" to accommodate them, or may order them to leave port when they are empty and it is windy.</p> <p>Harper rejected LNG on East Coast</p> <p>In 2006 and 2013, the Canadian government rejected plans for LNG vessel transits through Head Harbour Passage and Passamaquoddy Bay, New Brunswick, to a proposed LNG facility in Maine. Describing those Canadian waters as "a unique and highly productive marine ecosystem," the 2013 letter from the Canadian ambassador to the US Federal Energy Regulatory Commission summarized concerns related to "the environmental, navigational, and safety risks as well as the adverse economic consequences...". Which begs the question: What is so different about the setting for LNG vessel traffic proposed for BC?</p> <p>Although piloting will be required, Transport Canada has not announced its plans for LNG carriers on BC's north coast. According to its website, the Prince Rupert Port Authority is considering implementing "safe transit zones" and "traffic separation patterns to define specific routes for specific types of vessels." In other ports, separations of as much as an hour are required between LNG carriers and other watercraft.</p> <p>What about other boaters?</p> <p>Photo: Flickr/KsideB</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
769 (6 of 6)	2017-02-23	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>What if, as is likely, setbacks and separations are mandated around LNG vessels approaching BC's north coast? For one thing, LNG plants with planned multiple berths (Aurora, Pacific Northwest, and WCC) would not be allowed to have more than one LNG vessel at dock. But of greater importance, with the possibility of three LNG vessels a day entering and three a day exiting the port of Prince Rupert, what would be the effect on BC Ferries, the Alaska Marine Highway, the airport ferry, the Metlakatla ferry, water taxis, commercial fishing (especially salmon and herring openings), tour operators, cruise ships, and recreational boating and fishing?</p> <p>Why aren't these potential economic impacts and inconveniences being weighed against the touted benefits of the LNG industry? Although the issue was raised by the public during "consultation," why wasn't the possibility of restrictions to marine traffic included in the descriptions of any of the proposed LNG projects? Is it because the backlash would be over public safety, not mere inconvenience? And who in government has investigated the insurance requirements for LNG carriers and ports? Each LNG vessel is typically its own limited liability company, flying a flag of convenience; its owners beyond the reach of law should calamity occur.</p> <p>Graeme Pole lives near another LNG "ground zero" – in the Kispixox Valley, near the route of the Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project.</p> <p><a href="http://ecosocialistsvancouver.org/article/prince-rupert-risk-lng-tanker-danger-elephant-water">http://ecosocialistsvancouver.org/article/prince-rupert-risk-lng-tanker-danger-elephant-water</a></p>	

770 (1 of 3)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Community Health</p> <p>6.6.5.2. If construction is to occur continuously, 7 days a week, with two shift rotations each day (for approx. 5 years) where is the studies on how this will affect community health? What is the exact number of "10% of construction management workforce to be hired from the LAA"? Is that 1 person, 10 people, what? If 95% of the 5000 man work camp is to be fly-in/fly-out workers, that will be 4750 men flown in and out on a two-week rotational basis. How will the increase in flight traffic over Digby Island effect the communities there, how many planes is that, what would the increase in noise and air emissions from those planes alone be, or the traffic noise and air emissions from transporting those workers by bus to the workcamp directly behind Dodge Cove homes?</p> <p>Table 6.6-23 Fails to include the new propane storage terminal slated for Ridley on the Potential Cumulative Effects on Community Health.</p> <p>6.6.6.2 CNOOC-Nexen's claim that the Aurora LNG terminal is also expected to have positive effects on community health and wellness need to be supported with data. "While not considered in the assessment of cumulative effects, the Project is also expect to have positive effects" seems to be unsupported, therefore questionable. For communities such as Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove, there do not seem to be any positive cumulative effects.</p> <p>6.6.6.3 Residual Cumulative Effects</p> <p>"depending on the extent and success of mitigation measures implemented by project proponents, residents of the RAA may experience rapid changes in personal support networks and social environments, due to rapid influxes of population, increased levels of disposable income and a general expansion of RAA communities (includes changes in crime)" "mitigation measures proposed by Aurora LNG and other project proponents are therefore expected to manage to an acceptable level the cumulative adverse effects on personal support networks and social environments within the RAA" Where is the data to support whether or not these mitigation measures will work? Where is the data on how drastically these changes will affect the regional communities? Baseline data needs to be supplied on existing conditions, and more information supplied on the mitigation measures. Simple statements from the proponent saying that they are confident that mitigation measures will work is not enough.</p> <p>Summary Page 6.6-108</p> <p>"Cumulative effects with the project on community health and wellness are expected to be high in magnitude, extend throughout the RAA, to occur continuously over the long-term and within a socio-economic context that is not resilient to change. The Project's contribution to cumulative effects is reversible following decommissioning." These seem to be contradictory statements. How are the cumulative effects reversible?</p> <p>Residual Cumulative Effects Page 6.6-109 "the combined area of all project footprints is relatively small compared to the total available area within the RAA from which country foods harvesting can occur"</p> <p>What about the project footprint compared to the total area in the LAA from which country foods can be harvested? The impact of these projects all in the one small local area will be drastic, and less so at a regional level.</p> <p>"The magnitude of cumulative effect on country food harvesting due to land taken up by reasonably foreseeable projects will be low" what supports this statement</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.</p> <p>A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan that will include an infection control policy aligned with the Northern Health's Infection Control Plan Best Management Guide for Industrial Camps</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
770 (2 of 3)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Summary Page 6.6-110</p> <p>"The Project's contribution to a cumulative change in harvested foods will be low in magnitude and primarily occur within the LAA" "due to the relatively small size of affected harvesting areas relative to that available within the RAA, effects occur within a socio-economic context that is resilient to change" Saying that the changes will be mostly in the LAA, and comparing the size to the entire RAA is not an appropriate measurement.</p> <p>"adverse cumulative effects on harvested foods will be moderate in magnitude"</p> <p>"effects will be reversible following decommissioning" "because of the large size of the RAA, and availability and abundance of terrestrial and marine country food species available for harvesting, cumulative effects occur within a socio-economic context that is resilient to change"</p> <p>Where is the data to back up these statements? The Project destruction of large sections of the Skeena River Estuary, the permanent irreversible loss of 6,180 square metres of eelgrass (that supports marine food chains) will have high magnitude cumulative effects on country food harvesting, and will be irreversible. The permanent removal of entire ecosystems and old-growth forests on Digby Island and therefore food harvesting cannot just be reversed. The accumulation of toxins over time, in the soil and vegetation does not support this statement; how would this be reversible?</p> <p>Page 6.6-111 "it is unlikely that the magnitude of predicted effects will be as high as predicted in this assessment, therefore the likelihood of cumulative effects on country foods, is considered low."</p> <p>This is only supported by the assumption that all the proposed projects in the LAA will not be built, meanwhile this fails to recognize the residual cumulative effects that Aurora LNG will have on the LAA.</p> <p>Table 6.6-24 claims that the residual cumulative effects on community health ore low to moderate in magnitude, resilient in context, low in likelihood, and reversible. Where is the data and baseline studies to support these claims?</p> <p>Page 6.6-113</p> <p>"vulnerable populations and residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove are more likely to disproportionately experience adverse effects on community health and wellness due to lower levels of resiliency to change (i.e., there is low capacity for community health and wellbeing to recover from a perturbation (Project-effects) in consideration of baseline conditions among these populations)"</p> <p>No baseline conditions on these populations are presented with this statement. How much more likely to experience adverse effects?</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
770 (3 of 3)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Page 6.6-113</p> <p>"Thus when they do visit nearby communities (e.g. due to Project-related work or following the completion of shifts) they will be expected to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner" Does this mean that workers will be allowed to "visit" Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove, and Prince Rupert? Just because they are expected to behave in an appropriate manner doesn't mean that that will actually happen (e.g. much mention has been made of increased levels of crime, drug and alcohol use, and prostitution to supply camp workers) so how will this affect community health - especially on communitites that at present have none of these problems?</p> <p>6.6.8 Prediction Confidence</p> <p>"It is also not possible to predict with high confidence how individual households will respond to Project opportunities, or experience change in conditions affecting health, due to individual motivations and actions"</p> <p>Since there is a complete lack of baseline data to support how the changes will take place in these local Pacific Northwest communities, it is impossible to predict with any confidence "it is difficult to predict with precision changes in community health and wellness in either the residual effects case or in the cumulative effects case" does not support the statements that the residual effects or cumulative effects would be low/reversible.</p>	

771	2017-02-25	Peter J Williams - Houston, British Columbia	<p>The fact of the matter is Oil and Gas industry are what is wrong with the world. Only the corrupt governments and people directly involved benefit financially. This is as old as corruption itself. To the rest of us(including those who can not speak for themselves) this is about life. It is proven that Oil and Gas industry destroys the environment everywhere they go especially where it is extracted. It is also proven that WE tax payers always get the bill for so called clean ups and reclamation. Oil and Gas industries get paid millions of dollars a year just to be here. They then allege losses for the year and sue Canada for this alleged loss. They use tactics like paying Gitksan Development to sell out Gitksan people and traditional territories. Gitksan Development Gordon Sebastien, the elder gets paid over \$22 million dollars a year to destroy his own nation. Oil and gas industry do not let facts get in their way because they clearly believe they own everythin g and everyone here.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
772 (1 of 4)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>1)In all sections of the final application: changing the language of the Final Application to sometimes include Dodge Cove or Crippen Cove does NOT mean baseline studies are done or that the impacts to the residents of Digby Island are appropriately addressed.  2)Table 6.6-1 "Change in harvested foods" will effect much further that the prescribed LAA and RAA. The entire Skeena River and people that foodfish from the river could be affected, yet the entire Skeena River is not taken into account, or all the communities that eat from the River. ( RAA looks like it only goes up to Dorreen, does not even include Hazelton, Moricetown or any other communities further) Why is that?  The same could be said for the coastline. It is scientifically proven that the Skeena River salmon range widely up and down this coastline, but where are the changes in harvested foods for other areas that depend on this fish? Or eulachon, or any other harvested foods that could be affected by change in food chain/food web if Skeena River Estuary is impacted?  A description of how this would affect local communities is not the same as having accurate baseline data. Direct change (changes to local harvested foods) and indirect change (e.g. contribution to climate change and food supply) should both be studied.  3)Page 6.6-10 Technical Boundaries  Health Canada has identified the difficulty of general shortage of up-to-date info on health status and the determinants of health for communities and individuals, and a shortage of info on psychological well-being and socio-economic factors.  Health Canada identified difficulty in adapting health info collected for specific reporting and management purposes for use in the assessment of adverse residual and cumulative effects.  Baseline studies need to be accurately done before approval of projects, especially that are this large and would negatively impact community health.  4)Page 6.6-10 Info from Prince Rupert (LHA 52) is used to describe baseline conditions within the LAA. This does not accurately portray baseline conditions in the quiet, safe, rural residential areas on Digby Island.  This fails to capture the impact that CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG will have on local small communities especially the residents of Digby Island.  5)Page 6.6-14 The World Health Organization (WHO) broadly defines health as a "state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. Health includes consideration of social, economic, cultural and psychological well-being."  Yet the following determinants of health are completely omitted from the Community Health section of the Application: Education and literacy, Employment and working conditions, Physical environments, Healthy Child Development, Health Services, Gender, and Culture.  These omissions and the fact that very little baseline is available, fails to capture the entire impact that the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project will have on the residents of Dodge Cove, Crippen Cove, and Prince Rupert.  6) Page 6.6-26 Housing Vulnerability  This fails to capture the latest reports that Prince Rupert (mostly due to increased housing costs due to the LNG "boom") population has recently decreased drastically.  As well, many times residents on Digby Island have temporarily residences in town for the ability to stay overnight on very late work nights, or in extreme stormy conditions. That possibility is no longer available as a result of the direct increase in apartment rates.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.  A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.  We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
772 (2 of 4)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>7) Page 6.6-43, Table 6.6-17 Claims (during construction) that waste management (waste collection and treatment) will have no effect on a change in harvested foods. Claims that Commissioning and Start-up (includes hydro-testing and discharge to the marine environment) will have no effect on a change in harvested foods. Claims that Natural Gas pre-treatment and natural gas liquids extraction will not effect change in community health and wellness, or a change in harvested foods. Claims that (during Operation) waste management (collection, treatment if needed, and disposal of solid waste and wastewater, including stormwater and cooling water from the power generation facility water) will have no change on harvested foods. Claims that (during decommissioning and abandonment) that waste management will have no effect on a change in harvested foods.  These claims to have no potential to interact with community health are not considered further.  More information would need to be given to conclude that these interactions will not happen. These statements need to be justified.  8)Page 6.6-44 Change in Community Health and Wellness "all Project components and physical activities identified with in Table 6.6-16 have the potential to affect community health and wellness (for residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove) because they are associated with changes in population, and employment and income" yet Table 6.6-16 Health Benefits of Select Country Foods does not seem to apply to this statement - so what Table is the accurate one?  Page 6.6-44"Because all Project activities and physical works...can interact with community health and wellness, including those without a check mark..this component has been marked as having a potential interaction." So why would they not include a check mark, if the table is supposed to? Why if there is a seperate interaction for residents of Digby Island, why not just include a table showing ALL the components as checked for Digby Island? It is misleading to not checkmark the tables appropriately, but then to include "disclaimers" that the tables should actually be checked.  9)Page 6.6-45 Operations  The statement that natural gas pre-treatment and natural gas liquids extraction, or LNG production (including routine flaring!), and waste management will NOT have an adverse affect on change in harvested foods during operations needs to be studied and justified.  Since very little information has been given on these areas, concluding that they will NOT affect harvested foods seems presumptuous. Flaring DOES affect the surrounding environment and WILL affect harvested foods.  10)Page 6.6-45 Decommissioning and Abandonment There is no description of the length of time it would take for the claim that "remediation and reclamation of the site has the potential to beneficially affect harvested foods by increasing the abundance of targeted species, where harvesting of foods will have been reduced or restricted (by the project)".</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

772 (3 of 4)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Once these entire ecosystems have been removed, including red and blue listed ecosystems, and sensitive areas such as the impact to the rich Skeena River Estuary, where is the evidence that any of it would come back after? And if it does, how long would that take? How many 100's of years? Old growth forest ecosystems and glacial sands from the time of the caveman cannot just be replaced to what it presently is. Also "since no adverse effects on the volume of harvested foods from operations to post decommissioning are anticipated this interaction is not considered further." This claim needs to be justified. 11)Section 6.6.5.1 Claiming that the proximity of the worker camp to Dodge Cove (would be approx 950 m away from closest residence) fails to accurately describe the overlap of the Project into the Dodge Cove Official Community Plan. A much more accurate measure would be the distance from the worker camp to DODGE COVE OCP Boundary - which would be much closer. Or the description that the worker camp would actually be built across our existing watershed and trail systems - would change the assessment of the change to the Dodge Cove community health and wellness. 12) 6.6.5.3 The statements that air quality, noise, and freshwater acidification and eutrophication will NOT effect Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove residents does not present accurate long-term health effects of the thousands of tons of pollutants that would be released into our air, water, and soil annually. Page 6.6-65 Health Status "for residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove changes in the acoustic environment..could adversely affect levels of stress and anxiety and therefore health status." contradicts the statement just previously that noise will NOT effect Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove residents. The simple fact that a compressor station with engines comparable to 8 Boeing 747 jet engines will be built in very close proximity to the residences in Dodge Cove, how will that effect personal safety, social support networks, social environments, mental health, stress and anxiety, physical environments, culture? 13)Page 6.6-70 Presence of Workers The community of Dodge Cove, which is within walking distance from the camp facilities, and Crippen Cove..residents are at a greater risk of adverse effects as..the presence of a large workforce on Digby Island could adversely affect baseline levels of "sense of community belonging" and quality of life. How will having a 5000 man workcamp within 10 minutes walk of the private homes of Dodge Cove affect: personal safety, social support networks, social environments, mental health, stress and anxiety, physical environments, culture? 14) Will the residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove be within a gated controlled community that needs constant security and seperation from the rest of the island - simply because the site location of CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG is too close in proximity to the present existing safe, residential rural communities of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
772 (4 of 4)	2017-02-25	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>15)In the summary Page 6.6-72 "Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove residents and vulnerable populations, who are predicted to experience high magnitude effects" It is clear that vulnerable populations includes women, children, senior, fixed income households, lower income households, and homeless. The already vulnerable populations in Prince Rupert will be at HIGH RISK to experience negative effects, and the never-before vulnerable residents on Digby Island also will be at HIGH RISK to experience negative effects. This is unacceptable. Even saying this, how can the claim that "residual effects during Project operations will be low to moderate in magnitude - moderate for residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove" because of the relatively small operational workforce. Relative to what? The operational workforce (of 300 potential workers) alone is 6 X the size of the present full-time residents at Dodge Cove. And how are the adverse affects considered to be short term and reversible? In what way is 25 years short-term, or reversible once Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove are changed. How is it considered that the socio-economic context is resilient to change, when it is clearly stated that Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove has low resiliency. If this project is approved, the impacts to Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove will be long term, and irreversible. 16)Mitigation measures Table 6.6-21 The LNG carriers, tugs, and barges will be speeding around at 16 knots within the LAA - the average commercial fishboat travels at 6 knots, the average kayaker much slower. How will this speed impact existing marine traffic at the mouth of Prince Rupert Harbour. Tourists and locals presently kayak around the entire Digby Island, with most focusing on the south end of Digby Island and Delusion Bay. 17)Page 6.6-101 "Project activities and physical works are not expected to result in a degradation of environmental quality that would lead to a change in the quality of harvested foods that would support perceptions that would decrease consumption." How is this justified? It would seem that removing the entire ecosystems that support food harvesting would lead to a change in the quality of harvested foods, as well as changes to the volume of harvested foods, and the presence of an LNG terminal releasing toxins into the air, water, and soil will affect drastic changes to the local harvested foods as well as perceptions of food quality that would decrease consumption. The dredging that will cause suspension of contaminants back into food chains will also change harvested foods, and the perceptions that would decrease consumption. "based on the frequency of operational shipping and fishing techniques used within the LAA, the Project is predicted to have a low magnitude effect on marine harvesting" It would be hard to choose a location that would have a higher impact on the marine harvesting in the area, Spire Ledge is well known and the south end of Digby is a rich and essential area for local marine harvesting. This statement needs to be justified, what is CNOOC-Nexen basing this statement on? "it is predicted that the Project will have a negligible effect on harvestable marine resources and thus marine food consumption during operations" is also contradictory to local marine harvesting. That also fails to account for the impact that destruction in the Skeena River Estuary will have for the entire Skeena River and other areas on the coast that the Skeena River supplies marine harvest to. Claiming a low to moderate likelihood of residual effects on harvested foods in Table 6.6.5.5 need to be justified.. Changes to harvested foods are irreversible, and high likelihood to happen, high magnitude, low resiliency, unlike what the table is showing.</p>	

773	2017-02-25	Nancy Thacker	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This project must not be permitted. The cost to the environment and health of the residents in the area is unacceptable, even under controlled conditions. The habitat of the salmon would be destroyed and the effects of this would ripple down the food chain.</p> <p>The air, water and soil would be severely compromised. 95% of the local residents surveyed oppose this project - don't the people have a say in the conditions in which they and their ancestors have lived for generations? Our BC government must respect First Nation's Rights and honour Canada's commitment to reducing carbon emissions and climate change targets.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nancy Thacker, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
774	2017-02-25	Valerie Raynard	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The proposed Aurora LNG project threatens salmon, wildlife, and community health and safety for the surrounding area. Please DO NOT approve it. Most concerning, it is a threat to the very fragile salmon ecosystem which is part of our identity, our heritage, and our environment as British Columbians. It makes absolutely no sense to ruin the environmental future and legacy of British Columbians for a short term monetary gain to the government and a foreign multinational corporation.</p> <p>Politicians are supposed to protect and champion all their constituents' best interests, not those of foreign corporations or the rich elite.</p> <p>Thank you, Valerie Raynard Sincerely, Valerie Raynard, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
775	2017-02-25	Michael Cameron	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Stop destroying the planet.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael Cameron, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
776	2017-02-26	Amanda Lee - Burnaby, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please say no to Aurora LNG.</p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
777	2017-02-26	Becky Quirk - Nelson, British Columbia	<p>RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the Aurora LNG Dodge Cove project.</p> <p>My opposition is based largely on the known and unknown environmental impact this project would have. Permitting a project of this nature would be contrary to our obligation to protect our treasured wildlife of our province</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman From Subject Received Categories Becky Quirk Protect Dodge Cove from Aurora LNG Sun 6:27 PM lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area. In addition, the noise resulting from both the tankers and the facility itself would adversely affect the harbour porpoise.</p> <p>The project itself and the associated development would produce 15 megatons of carbon pollution every year. The gas shipped to Asia which this project is facilitating would cause another 69 megatons. It is not reassuring that a LNG pipe with similar features to the project proposed here has recently had a leak and even the experts are not sure of the environmental effect of that leak.</p> <p><a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/alaska-underwater-pipeline-leak-1.3987159">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/alaska-underwater-pipeline-leak-1.3987159</a></p> <p>In short, I am asking you to honour climate targets, protect our dwindling wildlife, and protect that unique nature of our province by stopping this proposal from proceeding.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>This letter was created with the use of an online letter writing tool at <a href="http://wildernesscommittee.org">wildernesscommittee.org</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>



778	2017-02-26	Jon Healey - Salt Spring Island, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>For the sake of the common people you serve do not allow Aurora to construct an LNG plant on Digby Island.</p> <p>When I was growing up on the coast in the 40s and 50s we had a thriving salmon fishery. Employing thousands of us. No longer;...instead we have hollowed out or derelict communities, boat basins full of derelict fishing vessels and poverty. The causes are varied and do include over fishing. But a major, possibly the most important cause has been habitat destruction. by industrial development. The fishery could be revived, provide employment for thousands and support healthy communities. But not if industries such as Petronas and now Aurora LNG are permitted to continue the destruction of important habitat. The serious deleterious effects of these developments can not be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated. For the sake of the common people you serve do not allow Aurora to construct an LNG plant on Digby Island.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
779	2017-02-27	Lisa Neste - High Point, NC	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office</p> <p>RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.</p> <p>This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.</p> <p>Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
780	2017-02-27	Barbara Vieira - Staten Island, New York	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office</p> <p>RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.</p> <p>This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.</p> <p>Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p> <p>This letter was created with the use of an online letter writing tool at <a href="http://wildernesscommittee.org">wildernesscommittee.org</a></p> <p>CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
781	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Burnaby, British Columbia	<p>I believe the environmental risks of our province need to be considered and given serious consideration before any mass project. The risks involved with this project in such a fragile precious ecosystem are not worth it. On top of that the risks involved with fracking in order to get the necessary amount of natural gas to support this plant are also not worth it. It is a short sighted project to line the pockets of a few while risking so much and to leave the tax payers paying for it long after it's run its course.</p> <p>Please consider the voice of the many and not just the few.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
782	2017-02-27	Jim Bradshaw - Maple Ridge, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office</p> <p>RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Please accept this letter as opposing this Aurora LNG project since the complete BC LNG push by the BC Liberal Government is totally irresponsible given the impossibility of meeting our climate targets such action creates.</p> <p>The era of fossil developments are over as such activity only further imperils our climate. It is time to face the facts and get your heads out of the sand and do something to develop renewable energy.</p> <p>This letter was created with the use of an online letter writing tool at <a href="http://wildernesscommittee.org">wildernesscommittee.org</a></p> <p>CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>
783	2017-02-27	Nii Jiits K am Han - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>Our next 7 generations need Mother Earth intact waterlife Our survival depends on the lands &amp; waters, please do not take it away by putting in liquid natural gas pipelines to our naturally pristine lands &amp; waters is potential for irreparable damage</p> <p>The lands &amp; waters for indigenous peoples is akin to mainstream society's cupboards &amp; fridge</p> <p>Its a stand for ALL humankind &amp; our next 7 generations</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

784	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace, British Columbia	Build it! Just wolves and deer no salmon streams. It's a no brainer	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
785	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld	It is wrong for our elected government to not keep environmental standards at the highest level possible. We only have one planet and it is in grave danger because of choices made by all of us. Be a leader in keeping British Columbia natural and meeting climate change targets. Say NO to destroying the province's natural world class beauty with fracking and LNG plants. We need leadership from all levels to protect not destroy the air we breathe and the water we need for survival.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
786	2017-02-27	Ian - Vancouver, British Columbia	Plants like these have been built all over the world, and in all cases, fish harvesting in the regions became obsolete for decades. It has long been a sustainable industry in the area, and this would adversely impact the local economy for short term gains, as the market for LNG wanes. We should be preserving Canada's north for future generations.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
787	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Chemainus, British Columbia	JUST FORGET ABOUT IT AINT EVER GOING TO HAPPEN	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
788	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Salish, British Columbia	NO LNG. Skeena deserves better. BC deserves better. The evidence of damages that will occur are everywhere, please be aware of the consequences, and please do not approve the LNG terminal in the Skeena.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
789	2017-02-27	Dave Anderson - Smithers, British Columbia	Economically - Financially - No long term value - Environmentally unstable - no long term benefit with the risk of air water pollution. The list goes on how stupid the government can be in even think this project or any others like will benefit Canada never mind BC or Prince Rupert. If the government thinks there is a market for LNG in China go to the NASA Earth site and have a look at the massive solar fields they are building. Their solar program make Canada look as they are in the dark ages! Which maybe true because our trade mentality is sell ourself sort ever since it discovered beaver and maple syrup. Just give it away ! China is the largest importer of Lithium that says something about the value of LNG!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
790	2017-02-27	Susan E Smith - Smithers, British Columbia	Once again the BC Liberal Government is trading off the the long term health and future of our priceless coastal habitat against the false promises of future prosperity! The proposed Aurora LNG fracked gas plant proposed by Nexen, for construction adjacent to Delusion Bay, puts at risk critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Flaring gasses pose risks and other concerns for bird life and mammals. Roadways, plant construction and acidification of the air and water will directly damage wetlands and the eel grass habitat vitally important to salmon. Tanker noise will impact harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. This project would also smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow Canada's carbon budget.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
791	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Squamish, British Columbia	British Columbia is not for corporate Sale leave the oceans alone.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
792	2017-02-27	Sarah Burgess - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I disagree with this project because of its close proximity to the people of Dodge Cove. I know that flaring does happen at LNG facilities, and have been around flaring once in my life. It instantly gave me a headache, and I felt unwell. We were in a vehicle, and approximately half a km to one km away. I cannot imagine it would be healthy to be living around this all the time. Not to mention the flammability of natural gas. This gives me a very uneasy feeling. Especially since I have such good friends that I cherish very much in Dodge Cove. This project does not belong in Prince Rupert. I am not against jobs, nor am I against this town growing, but I don't believe LNG is the way to do it! I would love for our town to grow and prosper, and there are so many wonderful people here. I feel like we can come up with better ideas that would bring more long term local jobs. So many of my friends are talking about leaving if this project goes through. People that contribute to this town. Business owners (several), teachers, carpenters, people in tourism, nurses, musicians, welders, mariners, librarians (to name a handful). People that have always loved this amazing city, but like I, just can't see themselves living in an LNG town. The thought of picking up and leaving a place I love so much, and have those relationships broken as we scatter across Canada really is not something I want to think about. I honestly dread this LNG decision almost every day, and hope that it doesn't come to fruition.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

793	2017-02-27	Peter van Eunen - Lower Mainland, British Columbia	Peter Van Eunen - The question is asked, in the face of building an industry that may be obsolete in 30 yrs. does it even make sense to put the entire region at risk? It would only make sense if all you're concerned with is short term (dubious) profits and you don't give a damn about the region or the people who call it their home. Christy!!!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
794	2017-02-27	Rhondi Hurlbut - Valemount, British Columbia	Please put the resources and focus of our tax dollars into renewable and sustainable energy. Water and all it sustains seems to be nowhere on the conscience or consideration of this government. Underground, rivers, streams and oceans are all in danger due to lack of oversight or foresight. Geothermal, solar and wind are successfully being used in so many parts of the world and we are still ripping and polluting for short term gain and a misguided economic philosophy that no longer works for the people or the earth.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
795	2017-02-27	Bradford Bryce - CA, USA	I hope that you will deny this permit and never allow this project to be built. It will destroy yet another beautiful place in exchange for corporate earnings	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
796	2017-02-27	Ann MacLeod - Victoria, British Columbia	No thanks to the proposed LNG Digby Island project. I want to see BC develop renewal energy sources asap and stop compromising our pristine river systems, watersheds and shorelines with oil and gas projects. NO NO NO.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
797	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Ontario	I'm ashamed to admit I'm Canadian. I'm ashamed that we are no longer viewed as environmental leaders in the world. The risk to all the inhabitants of Digby Island is just too great! Please, make the right choice.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
798	2017-02-27	Trina Wahl Whittaker - Port Albernie, British Columbia	Absolutely opposed to this. My family has ties to Dodge Cove on Digby Island spanning 5 generations. There is even a lake on the island (in a marsh that should be protected, not destroyed) named after my forefathers. Why not invest in renewable, clean energy? Not destructive, quick fix money makers at the expense of the environment and residents.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
799	2017-02-27	DAvid Bowering and Josette Wier - Terrace and Smithers, British Columbia	Please find attached our comments regarding the Aurora application.  Comment Submission	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
800 (1 of 5)	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Biodiversity is necessary to support ecosystems and support human life on earth. That is amazing: ESSENTIAL FOR HUMAN LIFE. Where in the Aurora LNG Final application does it address the fact that this export terminal would be drastically effecting the biodiversity on the B.C. coast and address the impacts it might have - to Canada - to the world - the impact to human life. This article is clear that the biodiversity of the B.C. Coast is GLOBALLY SIGNIFICANT. I believe that this fact needs to be looked at, and full impacts that this project (especially in the site proposed for the rich and sensitive Skeena Estuary which is a major source for B.C. coastal life) needs to be part of the assessment for this project. Many references below exist that provide further information on the biodiversity of the B.C. coast, and yet throughout the Aurora LNG Final application there seems to be many gaps on impact, missing species that use Digby Island and the Skeena Estuary, and the impact that this project would have on those species. It would be interesting for the impact to the human species on a larger scale to also be assessed, not just a "local" or "regional" impact. "The conservation of biodiversity, first recognized in the early 1980s (Wilson 1988), provides economic, scientific, cultural, and aesthetic values, but its greatest value is in maintaining the life-sustaining systems of the biosphere (UNEP 1992). In 2005, another global assessment conducted by many of the same organizations reported that humans have depleted 60% of the world's grasslands, forests, farmlands, rivers, and lakes (MEA 2005a). They also reported that human activity is putting such a strain on the natural ecological functions that the ability of the planet's ecosystems to sustain future generations can no longer be taken for granted (MEA 2005a). This accelerated extinction is the result of human activities such as altering and destroying habitat, pollution, over-harvesting species, introducing non-native species, and producing greenhouse gases that are causing a changing climate (Wilson 1992). Globally, the pressures on biodiversity are expected to continue or increase, further compromising the ability of these ecosystems to support human life (MEA 2005a, 2005b). Canada is the steward of major portions of the world's tundra, boreal and temperate forest, and aquatic ecosystems. Canada has an estimated 24 percent of the world's wetlands and constitutes about 20 percent of its circumpolar area. It is also one of the few countries in the world that maintains large, relatively unfragmented ecosystems with functioning natural processes. British Columbia's Biodiversity British Columbia occupies 10% of Canada's land area while containing more than half of Canada's vertebrates and vascular plants and three-quarters of its bird and mammal species (BCMELP 1993). Over 300 species of birds breed each year in British Columbia – more than any other province in Canada. Sixty-five species breed nowhere else in Canada and for several other species, British Columbia (specifically coastal British Columbia) holds the majority of the world population.  <b>(cont'd)</b>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.

800 (2 of 5)	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Coastal BC's Biodiversity Marine coastal ecosystems are among the most productive and diverse communities in the world (Poore and Wilson 1993). The rugged BC coast, with its characteristic fiords and islands, provides an environment that hastens the divergence of species by separating and isolating populations. As time goes by, isolated populations grow more adapted to their local environment and, in doing so, diverge in appearance or behaviour from other populations of their species. It is not surprising that 44 of the 62 vertebrate subspecies and significant populations endemic to coastal British Columbia occur on coastal islands (including Vancouver Island). As such, coastal BC is the most biologically diverse area of British Columbia. Specifically, -78% of all the mammal species in BC (D. Nagorsen, unpubl. data compiled for BC Ministry of Environment, 2004), -64% of the birds that regularly breed in BC (R. Cannings, unpubl. data compiled for BC Ministry of Environment, 2004), -64% of BC's amphibians (Green 1999), -69% of BC's reptiles (Gregory and Gregory 1999), and -67% of BC's freshwater fish species (McPhail and Carveth 1994) are found on the coast. Even more compelling is the extent to which endemic (meaning locally unique and native) species occur on the coast:          .Two-thirds of the mammal species and subspecies that are found only in BC occur nowhere else in the province but the coast (D. Nagorsen, unpubl. data compiled for BC Ministry of Environment, 2004).          .Three-quarters of the subspecies and significant populations of freshwater fish found only in BC are exclusive to the coast (McPhail and Carveth 1994; BC Ministry of Environment, unpub. data, 2004).          .All of the bird subspecies that breed only in BC do so exclusively on the coast (R. Cannings, unpubl. data compiled for BC Ministry of Environment, 2004).          .In the Queen Charlotte Islands alone, 8 of the 12 coastal endemic breeding birds occur, including local variants of Stellar's jay.          .Approximately 10% (238 of a total 2316) of the province's vascular plant taxa, including subspecies and varieties, occur only on the Pacific coast between Alaska and Mexico (Douglas et al. 2002).</p> <p>Coastal and Marine Birds There are over 200 species of common coastal birds with more than 120 species connected to our marine waters. More than five million seabirds use the B.C. coast as breeding habitat (Rodway 1991) including storm-petrels, rhinoceros auklets, ancient murrelets and Cassin's auklets (Gaston 2008). More than 75% of the global population of Cassin's Auklets breed and forage on islands and in the waters off the Queen Charlotte Basin.</p> <p>Marine Plants Marine plants include the microscopic phytoplankton and the larger species referred to as macroalgae (seaweed) and aquatic angiosperms. In British Columbia, more than 500 species of macroalgae have been recognized, making up about 4.5 % of the world's total marine algal species (Tunncliffe 1993, Hall 2008).</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
800 (3 of 5)	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Cold Water Marine Corals BC has a diverse range of cold-water corals with at least 61 recognized species (Jamieson et al. 2006) from many different groups including Gorgonian corals, Stony corals and Sea pens. Jamieson et al. (2006) provide a comprehensive overview of taxonomy of the cold-water corals of the B.C. coast.</p> <p>Hexactinellid Sponge Reefs BC's marine environment contains some of the only siliceous (hexactinellid or glass sponge) reefs in the world (Thompson 1981, Prescott-Allen 2005). Hexactinellid sponge reefs were thought to be extinct until 1987, when they were discovered in the waters of BC's Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound (Conway 1999). These glass sponge reefs can extend 18 metres in height from the sea floor and collectively cover an estimated 1,000 square kilometres (Fargo et al. 2007).</p> <p>Terrestrial invertebrates While significant efforts have been made to document species of birds and mammals, little is known about canopy arthropod communities. There are an estimated 163,487 species of insects in North America, of which only 66% are taxonomically known (Redak, 2000). In Canada, approximately half of the estimated 66,000 insects have been described, and in British Columbia there may be as many as 40,000 arthropod species, many of which are undescribed and associated with ancient forests. (Winchester, 2010 <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/~canopy/index.html">http://web.uvic.ca/~canopy/index.html</a>). Winchester's working group has suggested that canopies in the Pacific NW may be as diverse, if not more than, tropical rainforests.</p> <p>Coastal BC Ecosystems The biodiversity of coastal British Columbia is of global importance. The province's remaining old-growth coastal rainforests represent approximately one-quarter of all remaining coastal temperate rainforests worldwide (BCMOF 2004). These forests are globally rare, yet they have exceptionally high biological production and biological diversity. In addition, the province bears some of the global responsibility for at least 19 coastal species that, in addition to being at risk in BC, are also at risk globally (CDC 2005). * References          Much of the language in the above passages is paraphrased or taken verbatim from technical papers in the British Columbia Coast and Marine Environment Project 2006, Hall's 2008 State of the Ocean in the PNCIMA, and Biodiversity BC's Taking Nature's Pulse. The BC Coast and Marine Environment Project 2006 started in 2004 and was planned and funded in collaboration with Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the University of British Columbia Fisheries Centre, and the University of Victoria Geography Department, and Environment Canada. The Project focused on a region extending westward from the height of the Coast Mountains and included the marine area within Canada's 200-mile limit. The full report can be found at <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/soe/bcce/images/bcce_report.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/soe/bcce/images/bcce_report.pdf</a>. Biodiversity BC was formed as a partnership of government and non-government collaborations in 2005. Its funding ended in 2009. The full report can be found at <a href="http://www.biodiversitybc.org/">http://www.biodiversitybc.org/</a> BirdLife International. 2004. State of the World's Birds 2004: Indicators for our changing world. Cambridge, UK.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

800 (4 of 5)	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>BCMELP (Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks). 2006. British Columbia Coast and Marine Environment Project, 2006. Biodiversity Ministry of Environment, Victoria, B.C.</p> <p>BCMELP (Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks) 2000. Extinct and Extirpated Species. Wildlife in British Columbia at Risk brochure. Wildl. Br., Victoria, BC. <a href="http://wlapwww.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/extinct.pdf">wlapwww.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/extinct.pdf</a>.</p> <p>BCMOF (Ministry of Forests). 2004. 2004/05-2006/07 Service Plan. Victoria, BC. <a href="http://www.bcbudget.gov.bc.ca/bgt2004/sp2004/for/for_appendix1.htm">www.bcbudget.gov.bc.ca/bgt2004/sp2004/for/for_appendix1.htm</a>.</p> <p>Biodiversity BC. 2007. Taking Nature's Pulse: The Status of Biodiversity in British Columbia. <a href="http://www.biodiversitybc.org/EN/main/where/132.html">http://www.biodiversitybc.org/EN/main/where/132.html</a></p> <p>CDC (BC Conservation Data Centre). 2005. BC species and ecosystems explorer database. Ministry of Environment, Victoria. <a href="http://srmapps.gov.bc.ca/apps/eswp/">srmapps.gov.bc.ca/apps/eswp/</a>.</p> <p>Conway, K. W. 19 99. Hexactinellid sponge reefs on the British Columbia continental shelf: geological and biological structure with a perspective on their role in the shelf ecosystem. Canadian Stock Assessment Secretariat Research Document.</p> <p>Douglas, G.W., D. Meidinger, and J. Pojar (eds.). 2002. Illustrated flora of British Columbia, vol. 8: General summary, maps, and keys. Minist. For. and Sustain. Resour. Manage., Victoria, BC.</p> <p>Fargo, J., L. MacDougall, and I. Pearsall. 2007. Ecosystem overview: Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA): Appendix G: Groundfish.</p> <p>Gaston, A. J. 2008. Seabirds. Environment Canada. in <a href="http://www.ecoinfo.ec.gc.ca/env_ind/region/seabird/seabird_e.cfm">http://www.ecoinfo.ec.gc.ca/env_ind/region/seabird/seabird_e.cfm</a></p> <p>Green, D.M. 1999. The amphibians of British Columbia: A taxonomic catalogue. Wildl. Br., Minist. Environ., Lands and Parks, Victoria, BC. Wildl. Bull. B-87.</p> <p>Gregory, L.A., and P.T. Gregory. 1999. The reptiles of British Columbia: A taxonomic catalogue. Wildl. Br., Minist. Environ., Lands and Parks, Victoria, BC. Wildl. Bull. B-88.</p> <p>Hall, A. 2008. State of the Ocean in the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA). David Suzuki Foundation. 159pp.</p> <p>IUCN (World Conservation Union). 2003. 2003 IUCN Red list of threatened species. <a href="http://www.redlist.org">www.redlist.org</a>.</p> <p>Jamieson, G. S., and L. Chew. 2002. Hexactinellid sponge reefs: areas of interest as Marine Protected Areas in the North and Central Coast. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document:77.</p> <p>Jamieson, G. S., N. Pellegrin, and S. Jessen. 2006. Taxonomy and zoogeography of cold water corals in explored areas of coastal British Columbia. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document:49.</p> <p>McPhail, J.D., and R. Carveth. 1994. Field key to the freshwater fishes of British Columbia: Draft for 1994 Field Testing. Aquatic Inventory Task Force, Resources Inventory Committee, Victoria, BC.</p> <p>MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment). 2005a. Ecosystems and human well-being: Biodiversity synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. <a href="http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx">www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx</a>.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
800 (5 of 5)	2017-02-27	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment). 2005b. Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. <a href="http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx">www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx</a>.</p> <p>MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment). 2005c. Ecosystems and human well-being: Wetlands and water synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. <a href="http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx">www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Products.Synthesis.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Prescott-Allen, R. 2005. Coast Information Team Review Report. Cortex Consultants Inc.</p> <p>Poore, G.C.B., and G.D.F. Wilson. 1993. Marine species richness. Nature 361:597-598.</p> <p>Redak, Richard. 2000. Arthropods and Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plans: Are We Missing Something? Environmental Management, Volume 26, Supplement 1</p> <p>Rodway, M. S., and M. J. F. Lemon. 1991. British Columbia seabird colony inventory: Report # 8 – Queen Charlotte Strait and Johnstone Strait. Technical Report Series 123:82.</p> <p>Stuart, S.N., J.S. Chanson, N.A. Cox, B.E. Young, A.S.L. Rodrigues, D.L. Fishman, and R.W. Walter. 2004. Status and trends of amphibian declines and extinctions worldwide. Science 306:1783-1786.</p> <p>Thompson, R. E. 1981. Oceanography of the British Columbia coast. Canadian Special Publications of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 56:291.</p> <p>Tunncliffe, V. (1993) Biodiversity: the marine biota of British Columbia. in Our Living Legacy: Proceedings of a Symposium on Biological Diversity. M. A. Fenger, E. H. Miller, J. A. Johnson &amp; E. J. Williams (eds), Royal B. C. Museum, Victoria: pp. 191-200.</p> <p>UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 1992. Preamble, convention on biological diversity. United Nations. <a href="http://www.biodiv.org/convention/articles.asp">www.biodiv.org/convention/articles.asp</a>.</p> <p>UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2001. Global biodiversity outlook. United Nations. <a href="http://www.biodiv.org/gbo/default.asp">www.biodiv.org/gbo/default.asp</a>.</p> <p>Wilson, E.O. (ed.). 1988. Biodiversity. National Academy Press, Washington, DC., 521pp.</p> <p>Wilson, E.O. 1992. The diversity of life. W.W. Norton and Co., New York.</p> <p>Winchester, Neville <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/~canopy/winchest.html">http://web.uvic.ca/~canopy/winchest.html</a></p> <p>World Conservation Monitoring Centre. 1992. Global biodiversity: Status of the Earth's living resources. Chapman and Hall, London, UK. xx + 594pp. <a href="https://www.raincoast.org/2011/05/bc-coastal-biodiversity/">https://www.raincoast.org/2011/05/bc-coastal-biodiversity/</a></p>	
801	2017-02-27	Sheila Dobie - Saltspring Island, British Columbia	<p>Dodge Cove is a settlement of people! This is not land to just do what you want with. It is the home to many people in every season and has been for generations- including a vast history of First Nations use and habitation.</p> <p>I lived in this village for 28 years raising my family.</p> <p>My friends living there have described what seems like complete disregard to their presence- thus company needs to be taken to task for their plan to impact such a community. Water quality values, recreational areas and residential quality of life are all at stake. The Environmental values are being threatened- thus is a very sensitive ecological zone. I'm astonished that this project is proceeding based on a development for an energy type with no future.</p> <p>Please refuse this Development!</p> <p>Invest time and resources in true renewable energy!</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

802 (1 of 2)	2017-02-27	Roland Alcock - Sooke, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to urge you to reject the huge liquid natural gas (LNG) plant proposed by Nexen on Digby Island not far from the mouth of the Skeena River in BC.</p> <p>Firstly, I oppose the approval of the Nexen Aurora LNG terminal on Digby Island as it poses a very significant threat to the second-largest salmon run in Canada and the communities and entire ecosystems that depend on it. There is direct experience from Russia of the ecological damage such a huge LNG industrial development close to the estuary of a salmon bearing river can do. The site of the proposed Digby Island plant would be a disaster for migrating sockeye, steelhead and coho salmon as it is an estuarine and wetland environment similar to Flora Bank at the mouth of the Skeena river. These habitats are the crossroads for migrating juvenile and spawning salmon.</p> <p>Secondly, and even more seriously, the proposed project violates the self-determination and sovereignty of the the Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala first nations as the proposed site is within their Traditional Territories. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, BC and Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. Approving it would break Prime Minister Trudeau's promise to prioritize and rebuild relationships with First Nations.</p> <p>Thirdly, there is the much bigger context of the proposed project in that it completely opposes and renders moot any Government of Canada commitment to more direct and immediate actions to combat climate change.</p> <p>In late 2015 the IPCC released its latest report and this distinguished scientific body has continued to up the ante and sound the warning that anthropogenic causes are certainly behind the unprecedented global warming being experienced in recent decades. Scientists at NASA and NOAA have recently reported data to show the year 2016 did in fact break the former 2015 record as the warmest globally ever recorded!</p> <p>The dire impacts from these climate changes have already been felt in BC with the expansion of the devastation caused by the mountain pine beetle, and the increasing appearance of the tick that causes Lyme disease. These are very real economic and health impacts which already affect the people of BC directly!</p> <p>In addition, there are serious consequences for the Canada's North as climate change is radically altering the environment and threatening the way of life of the northern indigenous peoples.</p> <p>In the light of all this, it is unconscionable that the government of BC is actively encouraging and enabling the growth of the LNG industry. The huge export volumes contemplated will generate millions of tons of carbon added to the earth's atmosphere. These impacts will stem from the burning of the fossil fuel and also more seriously from methane pumped into the atmosphere from infrastructure leaks and from "fracking" activities which smash the rock strata to release the methane gas.</p> <p>These climate change contributions will not just cause environmental impacts to worsen "somewhere far away" - the effects will be felt right here in BC! "Exporting" emissions does not absolve BC from suffering the impacts. The current BC government policy is directly supporting and adding to the destruction of the BC economy and threatening the health and well being of BC citizens.</p> <p>In addition, there is no way to both approve this project and honour the 1.5 degree global warming limit agreed to by the Government of Canada at the recent Paris conference.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p> <p>The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.</p>
802 (2 of 2)	2017-02-27	Roland Alcock - Sooke, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>For example a similar LNG terminal project has been proposed by Pacific Northwest/Petronas on Lelu Island right at the mouth of the Skeena. To quote the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's (CEAA) conclusion on page 52 of the draft report on that project "The Agency concludes that the Project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects as a result of greenhouse gas emissions after taking into consideration the implementation of best achievable technology and management practices and compliance with the B.C. Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act".</p> <p>On the basis of the climate change impact of these two projects alone, the BC Government should work with the Federal Government, on behalf of all Canadians to:- Place an immediate moratorium on all further natural gas expansion and "fracking" activity. Fracking is a very destructive method of extreme energy extraction and a step in the wrong direction for the climate, water and public health. Halt or seriously slow down plans to massively increase LNG production and export. Permanently ban the construction of more pipelines across BC designed to enable shipment of millions of tons of fossil fuels for export. The BC Government could then divert the money that is earmarked for massive infrastructure upgrades in support of LNG, including the expansion of BC Hydro's generating capacity via the proposed Site C dam and instead implement home energy efficiency improvement programs, invest in green energy development (especially wind power), and fund green energy R&amp;D at our institutes of learning and research. Many more jobs will be created in BC on a permanent sustainable basis by building a local energy industry based on renewables. Germany has already made enormous strides in employing solar power as have several US states such as Arizona. BC could do the same, as could the rest of Canada. All that is required is some vision, leadership and a recognition that the government in power today is not just working to secure a healthy and prosperous future for the present, but owes a similar debt to the future generations of the citizens of BC and Canada. The citizens of BC will not stand idly by while the BC Government blindly aligns with and supports the forces that would continue to destroy the earth's environment and download billions of dollars worth of agricultural, forestry, fisheries, coastal property, and other economic and health damages onto future generations of Canadians. I therefore urge the BC EAO to reject the proposed Nexen Aurora LNG terminal on Digby Island near the Skeena estuary. Thank you. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	

803	2017-02-27	Virgil Pauls - Winnipeg	<p>Dear EAO, Aurora LNG threatens salmon and wildlife The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Aurora LNG threatens our climate As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Say no to Aurora LNG! cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
804	2017-02-27	Mary-Ann Reid - Vernon, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO, Please protect Canada--our home. Please, please, do not allow the LNG fracking practises proposed by Nexen. Our water and all the life in and near our rivers and oceans is fragile, and our land is precious. We depend on the health of our land, water, salmon, and all other wildlife. This project puts our environment and human life at risk. Say NO to Aurora LNG! cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
805	2017-02-27	Nicole Boon - Maple Ridge, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO, I a deeply concerned about the threat the Aurora LNG plant will have on Skeena salmon and wildlife. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. This plant will also threaten community health and safety. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Finally, Aurora plant threatens our climate. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Clearly, the Aurora LNG plant is a terrible idea. One that this province does not want or need. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
806	2017-02-27	Kathleen Williams - Lehigh Acres	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kathleen Williams, Lehigh Acres cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
807	2017-02-27	Allen Olson - Minneapolis	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Allen Olson, Minneapolis cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment..</p>
808	2017-02-27	Mary Thomas - Richmond, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Mary Thomas, Richmond cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>

809	2017-02-27	giana peranio paz hendersonville	Dear EAO, Sincerely, giana peranio paz, hendersonville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
810	2017-02-27	mandi T - Los Altos	Dear EAO, Sincerely, mandi T, Los Altos cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
811	2017-02-27	Walter Firth - Wollstonencraft	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Walter Firth, Wollstonencraft cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
812	2017-02-28	andreas vlsiadis, athens-greece	Dear EAO, Sincerely, andreas vlsiadis, athens-greece cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
813	2017-02-28	Margie Fourie FOURIE, PORT ELIZABETH	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Margie Fourie FOURIE, PORT ELIZABETH cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
814	2017-02-28	Marina Parfenova, Moscow	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Marina Parfenova, Moscow cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
815	2017-02-28	mauricio carvajal, 9291583	Dear EAO, Sincerely, mauricio carvajal, 9291583 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
816	2017-02-28	Bonnie Faith, Cambridge, MA USA	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Bonnie Faith, Cambridge, MA USA cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
817	2017-02-28	Hal Trufan, Matthews	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Hal Trufan, Matthews cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
818	2017-02-28	Ronald Ratner, Sioux Falls	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ronald Ratner, Sioux Falls cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
819	2017-02-28	Colleen Lobel, 92126	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Colleen Lobel, 92126 cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
820	2017-02-28	Dianne Douglas, Phoenix	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Dianne Douglas, Phoenix cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
821	2017-02-28	Donlon McGovern, Portland	Dear EAO, The placement of Aurora LNG poses a grave environmental threat to an established industry, salmon. The ecological dominos toppled by the harm from fracking begin with the salmon to the wildlife dependent upon them as a food source to the First Nations people dependent upon them not only as a food source but as an economic benefit. Don't allow the Chinese to profit at the cost to your people and your environment as well as your economy. Do it right and the salmon will pay you back for many generations to come. Sincerely, Donlon McGovern, Portland cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.



822	2017-02-28	Sheila Desmond, Cameron Park	Dear EAO, I've known numerous fishermen throughout the years; hardworking men and women who would probably lose their livelihood if these salmon were killed. Aurora LNG is not interested in the environment, the salmon, the livelihood of our fishermen, or the health of the ocean. Digby Island is a beautiful, natural resource of British Columbia and needs to be protected. The people of Prince Rupert do not need their area polluted and destroyed over greed, nor does the rest of British Columbia need the entire environment destroyed over money.  ' Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Sheila Desmond, Cameron Park cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
823	2017-02-28	JOHN PASQUA, Escondido San Diego County	Dear EAO, DUMP THE AURORA L.N.G TODAY TO SAVE THE WETLANDS AND SALMON HERE. Sincerely, JOHN PASQUA, Escondido San Diego County cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
824	2017-02-28	Chrisy Clark	Dear EAO, Sincerely, cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
825	2017-02-28	John Brewer, Montreal	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG plant should not be built for the following reasons.. 1. The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. 2. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. 3. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.. Sincerely, John Brewer, Montreal cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
826	2017-02-28	Bonnie Lynn MacKinnon, Georgetown	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Bonnie Lynn MacKinnon, Georgetown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
827	2017-02-28	Martina Capannini, Firenze	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Martina Capannini, Firenze cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
828	2017-02-28	Peter Cummins, Cairns	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Peter Cummins, Cairns cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
829	2017-02-28	cristina nagy, mar del sur	Dear EAO, Sincerely, cristina nagy, mar del sur cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
830	2017-02-28	NANCY O, NEWARK	Dear EAO, Sincerely, NANCY O, NEWARK cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

831	2017-02-28	Julie Sasaoka, concord	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Julie Sasaoka, concord cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
832	2017-02-28	Rob Seltzer, Malibu	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Rob Seltzer, Malibu cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
833	2017-02-28	Ma. Elena Guillermo, Merida	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ma. Elena Guillermo, Merida cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
834	2017-02-28	Fleurette Burak, StCatharines	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Fleurette Burak, StCatharines cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
835	2017-02-28	DEBORAH SMITH, OKLAHOMA CITY	Dear EAO, THIS IS A VERY BAD "THING"!!! AND THE WHOLE ISSUE MAKES ME VERY ANGRY!!!!THIS CARBON BOMB MUST BE STOPPED!!! The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.. The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of local residents were opposed to the project. Sincerely, DEBORAH SMITH, OKLAHOMA CITY cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
836	2017-02-28	Betty Kowall, Salmon River	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Betty Kowall, Salmon River cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
837	2017-02-28	Andrea Frank, Beach Park	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Andrea Frank, Beach Park cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
838	2017-02-28	Ruth Rogers, Woolwich	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ruth Rogers, Woolwich cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
839	2017-02-28	Laraine Bowen, Oakville	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Laraine Bowen, Oakville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
840	2017-02-28	Dagmar L. Anders, Chemnitz	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Dagmar L. Anders, Chemnitz cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
841	2017-02-28	Tami Palacky, Springfield	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Tami Palacky, Springfield cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
842	2017-02-28	Diane Kent, Phoenix	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Diane Kent, Phoenix cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
843	2017-02-28	Beth McHenry, Parksley	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Beth McHenry, Parksley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
844	2017-02-28	Anna Jasiukiewicz, Ostrów Wielkopolski ostrowski	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Anna Jasiukiewicz, Ostrów Wielkopolski ostrowski cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

845	2017-02-28	Anita Coolidge, Cardiff by the Sea	Dear EAO, Well, yet another disastrous plan that will wreak havoc on nature...and all for greed!!! Please say NO to this. We all need to go GREEN -- NOT greeD!!! Sincerely, Anita Coolidge, Cardiff by the Sea cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
846	2017-02-28	Cheryl McEachern - Vancouver	Dear EAO and ministers, As a registered voter in British Columbia, I am writing to insist that you do everything you possibly can to block the approval or construction of the Nexen Aurora LNG plant being proposed. That land and water is so much more valuable to us as a healthy, natural ecosystem that delivers nutritious food and clean, breathable air for all than it could ever be as a source of profits for distant Chinese billionaires. We really need to get past the idea that cash is the valuable bit in life. We can't reach our provincial or national climate targets AND build such a catastrophic mess. We need to get past the antiquated Industrial Age. There are SO many new sources of energy generation. These legacy fossil fuels are dangerous, outdated and ludicrous. We have all the resources and information available at our fingertips right now for B.C. and Canada to be innovative world leaders in clean energy and technology development. With the shambles that the United States are in, we could surpass them on the world stage, yet we are stuck with too many embarrassingly greedy and unimaginative politicians who lack the clarity or leadership to seize this chance. How about you? Are you ready to be a person worth remembering in the history books of Canada? Do you have the fortitude to fight the good fight and speak out against corporations buying our country out from under us? We're counting on you to use the power afforded to you to make our country one worth respecting on the world stage. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Cheryl McEachern, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
847	2017-02-28	Carol Thompson - South Park	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Carol Thompson cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
848	2017-02-28	Lawrence Crowley - Louisville	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Lawrence Crowley, Louisville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
849	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Nanaimo, British Columbia	The environment of Digby Island and surrounding territory cannot support projects of this type. Do not allow this to happen.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
850	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Don't do this. We rely on this land/water to sustain us.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
851	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Terrace, British Columbia	Please stay away from Digby.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
852	2017-02-28	Christine Leipscher - Squamish, British Columbia	I've become more and more disappointed in our government and the lack of concern they seem to have for our environment, and the people living amongst it. This is just one more huge nail in the coffin of our coastline.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
853	2017-02-28	Frances Fasano - North Vancouver, British Columbia	THIS IS SO WRONG. When are we going to realize we cannot keep doing this to our planet. This should not go ahead.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
854	2017-02-28	Samuel Grenier - Kelowna, British Columbia	Whether we build this facility on Lelu or Bigby island there is no difference. The key to the issue that its not a feasible project. Not for our economy, not for jobs, and not for the environment it will impact. Ask yourselves whether youd throw away a multimillion dollar industry (renewable) for a pipeline and tankers that could destroy our pristine wildlife and land. Wake up and smell the roses! This is irresponsible and plain down right wrong. I want our evonomy to flourish too, but not in this manner! Make the right decision. Your re-election counts on it.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

855	2017-02-28	John Muirhead - Courtenay, British Columbia	LNG is not a green solution to climate problems. Christy Clark is pushing this industry as our contribution to solving our GHG emissions in BC. It's been proven that from beginning to end, LNG can be worse than coal when it comes to emissions. Not to mention the effects of tanker traffic for marine mammals and the added potential for spills.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
856	2017-02-28	David O'Kane - Vancouver, British Columbia	A project of this size that only has a 30 year lifespan is certainly not worth the possible destruction of wildlife and fish habitat on and around Digby Island and the Skeena River. The majority of B.C. taxpayers will never see a tangible benefit from this development. The low cost of natural gas makes this particular project uneconomical. We should be looking east to market our gas to Alberta (and other provinces) as they begin to replace their coal-fired plants. New technology makes gas fired electricity generation cheap and comparably cleaner. Please do not make a politically motivated decision. You must speak for ALL British Columbians. Thank you for your service	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
857	2017-02-28	Sheryl McDougald - Roberts Creek, British Columbia	NO Digby Island terminal!! Bad science, bad for wildlife, outdated technology, too close to towns, and a terrible waste of resources	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
858	2017-02-28	franz scholz - West Kelowna, British Columbia	what is the matter with you ignorant people,has big oil and gas filtered so deeply into your psyche that your willing to expose one of canadas biggest fisheries to its ultimate destruction all for the sake of corporate greed...shame on you...wind,solar and Geo thermal are far better,safer and in the long term renewable energy sources...start investing into the future not the destructive,dirt past	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
859	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	I support the Aurora LNG Project.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
860	2017-02-28	Heather Ross - Ontario	No. Just. NO. I was born in Terrace. Leave The Mighty Skeena to the indigenous people who've cared for it for the millennia.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
861	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Comments: poorly sited (project too close to heavily populated area) inadequate consideration of cumulative effects (on both marine environment and social/economic impacts) disregards recommendations from Province's own commitments on marine spatial planning and Federal Oceans Act; fails to articulate how project corresponds with local municipal, regional, First Nations and prov/federal planning and land-use frameworks. short-term economic opportunism at the expense of long-term social-economic resilience rationalizing this (and other LNG) projects as "good for the climate" is shockingly irresponsible, insulting and indefensible - it relies on manipulative cherry-picking of facts about carbon emissions. A disgusting dereliction of responsibility on the part of decision-making and regulatory bodies. typical steamrolling development decisions masquerading as consultation	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
862	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Hagensborg, British Columbia	We must protect what remains from a century of destruction. Invest in alternative energies. Petroleum is over! Let Canada become a leader in alternative fuels!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
863	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Powell River, British Columbia	People and the environment before profit!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
864	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Victoria, British Columbia	NO, just NO for all the very obvious reasons--salmon, First Nations, danger to FN and Prince Rupert communities from an explosion and other adverse pollution etc. NO, this should be a no-brainer	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
865	2017-02-28	Steve - Kitimat, British Columbia	the questions that should be asked are:- what are the risks to the environment and the people of this area? do the economic benefits to the greater area as well as the people of Prince Rupert out weigh the risk to the environment ? would the project benefit some areas of the environment than others and what affect would this have on the Eco system. if the benefits to the wider community outweigh the possible risk to the environment then I say go for it. People who use fossil fuels for transport, heating, clothing and food should look hard at themselves before jumping on the "Not in my back yard" band wagon.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
866	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Cortes Island, British Columbia	The long lasting environmental destruction is not worth the gamble for perhaps 30 years of use. The proposed building site is too close to human habitation and the island contains a unique ecosystem of wet lands that should be protected, not developed. No to Aurora LNG on Digby Island. Absolutely NOT!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

867	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Victoria, British Columbia	This project should not proceed. It is economically flawed and environmentally a disaster. In the name of short term gain, which is debatable, the project will cause irreparable long term damage. The world is moving toward more efficient power and energy production. When we get there, do you want to look back on these types of projects and say to yourself "Wow, if only we had not done that. If only we had invested in new technology instead." These types of projects are archaic and only serve a handful of people economically but harm masses environmentally. Use the science. Do not bow to the companies that are putting the pressure on. Listen to your heart and head.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
868	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Victoria, British Columbia	Renewable and environmentally safe energy is where cutting edge world leaders are at. We are so provincial in BC. We're a joke. No to LNG!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
869	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Denman Island, British Columbia	No to anything to do with LNG, pipelines, gas, oil or other hydrocarbons - Leave Digby Island alone. As an islander, I understand their fragile ecosystems must be preserved and protected for future generations	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
870	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Creston, British Columbia	This environmental disaster must be stopped.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
871	2017-02-28	Michele Rodger - Terrace, British Columbia	I do not understand why we continue to pus for a facility that is so in the wrong place. For an industry that has such a dirty process of extraction, that is going to cause problems for the water ways for generations to come and then the government has the audacity to call LNG green. What the hey is wrong with this picture -everything. Do not allow an LNG plant on Rigby Island - the protest well be great, there are many who are rightly so very apposed to this and they well stand for what is right.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
872	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Gabriola, British Columbia	These waters are too precious to be risked. Put the money into a safer energy, please. This energy solution is so short-term and the harm to wildlife and people's sustainability too great.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
873	2017-02-28	Tom A Bates - Victoria, British Columbia	The world is flooded with LNG. With solar coming on line there is no need for this. Do you know what you are doing? We will have to PAY contrys to buy our LNG, please give your head a shake. No to dams, pipe lines, and LNG. More people working in the green industry than the oil business. Thank You Tom Bates	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
874	2017-02-28	Gary J Parker - Victoria, British Columbia	As a tax paying citizen of Canada and resident of BC, I utterly and completely reject,oppose and condemn this proposal. It makes no economic sense and it is a clear and present danger to the environmental integrity of our pristine coast. I will oppose this and contribute towards resisting it if implemented. An absurd, ill thought out and ridiculously unrealistic proposal	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
875	2017-02-28	Personal Information Withheld - Cloyne, Ontario	NO. NO. NO. Digby island is a treasure. Enough that the airport is there. No where else in our country have I seen more creatures of nature in such a small area	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
876	2017-02-28	Diana Schroeder - Courtenay, British Columbia	LNG cannot proceed under the current environmental review process that does not take into account the upstream issues in regards to fracking and waste. It also omits an assessment of impact of increased tanker traffic and emissions. We must have an opportunity to look at the social implications as well. We know that, with the corporate taxes so low, it is not in the best interest of British Columbians to sacrifice their wild salmon fishery, Native fishery and their sustainable tourist industry.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
877	2017-02-28	Lawrence Crowley, Louisville	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Lawrence Crowley, Louisville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
878	2017-02-28	Gwen Hadland - Hillsboro	Dear EAO, Having been a resident of Dodge Cove for a number of years, the possibility of the construction of an LNG plant in that area deeply disturbs me. I was also a salmon fisherman in the area & know of the damage that could be done to this important fishing area. it is a beautiful & critical place for salmon. Since it is also near the Metlakatla reserve, I feel we owe it to the native population to do all we can to preserve their fishing rights. These are the original people & deserve to be treated with respect. Please do all in your power to prevent this LNG plant to be constructed. Thank you! Sincerely, cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
879	2017-02-28	Carol Jurczewski - Riverside	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Carol Jurczewski, Riverside cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

880	2017-02-28	Barbara Vieira - Staten Island	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen. The location of this plant will be a threat to the Skeena actuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone and will negatively effect the wild salmon economy in that region. This project must be stopped Sincerely, Barbara Vieira, Staten Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
881	2017-02-28	Ilia Fridland - Cantley	Dear EAO, As a Canadian who loves British Columbia, I am writing to politely demand that the Aurora LNG project be firmly rejected. The risk to wild salmon stocks is not worth the temporary wealth this dirty project would generate. Sincerely, Ilia Fridland, Cantley cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
882	2017-02-28	Aaron Bouchard - Bridgewater	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Aaron Bouchard, Bridgewater cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
883	2017-02-28	Stephanie Whitman - west kelowna, British Columbia	British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman RE: Comment on Aurora LNG Hello, I am a deeply concerned citizen, writing to you in all my hopes, that you will hear the voices of the people of the lands that you so govern and protect. Over the past century humanity has taken an enormous toll on the planet as a whole, this I am sure you are aware of. This project is only taking another deep dark step further in hurting the beautiful planet that we live on and rely on for life, our mother earth. Not only will this project be hugely disruptive for the community of Dodge Cove, but it will have such a devastating impact on the natural environment of the area and the planet as a whole. We must all take responsibility as humans to protect the lives of those we put at risk against their will, incredible beings such as the harbour porpoise who will be dramatically effected by the noise from the tankers and facility. The great blue heron and many other birds habitat this area and to preserve their environment is vital to their survival, and the survival of this entire ecosystem. With climate change on the rise, we need to take action now in all ways that we can. This project is a step in the completely wrong direction. If humans are going to have a future on this planet, it is going to need to be a sustainable future. I know that we can do better than this as humans. I know we have the technology to live sustainably and symbiotically with our planet. Putting the environment first is simultaneously putting ourselves first. This project will make it impossible for BC to meet its climate targets to reduce emissions with the amount of pollution it will cause, while also violating international siting standards that require projects to be located away from population centers and other marine traffic. Our coast, our communities and our climate is under so much risk, I urge you to please lend your consideration and compassion. Thank you, This letter was created with the use of an online letter writing tool at wildernesscommittee.org cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
884	2017-02-28	Brittney Kneller - West Kelowna	Dear EAO, I strongly feel that this would greatly impact the salmon and wildlife in the area. Migratory birds and other animals will suffer severe habitat loss. It will also impact the environment in which the community lives. The resources the community uses will be polluted by the emissions produced. For these reasons, I strongly disagree with this project. Thank you. Sincerely, Brittney Kneller, West Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
885	2017-02-28	freddie williams - benoni	Dear EAO, STOP AURORA LNG NOW! AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
886	2017-02-28	Stella Gambardella - Roma	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Stella Gambardella, Roma cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

887	2017-02-28	Ed Vieira - Staten Island	Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen. The location of this plant will be a threat to the Skeena actuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone and will negatively effect the wild salmon economy in that region. This project must be stopped. This project must be stopped Sincerely, Ed Vieira, Staten Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
888	2017-02-28	Victoria Peyser, Newark	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Victoria Peyser, Newark cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
889	2017-02-28	Joan Walker - Bishop	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Joan Walker, Bishop cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment..
890	2017-02-28	Animae Chi, NY	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Animae Chi, NY cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
891	2017-02-28	diana Schroeder - courtenay	Dear EAO, Sincerely, diana Schroeder, courtenay cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
892	2017-02-28	natasha salgado - Toronto	Dear EAO, Sincerely, natasha salgado, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
893	2017-03-01	lamme janssen - Whaletown, British Columbia	To be sending dirty, fracked fuel to another country through pipelines over b.c. and freighters in the oceans is irresponsible, especially when it is a fuel that is becoming economically not viable. The risk to the B.C. environment and to our planet just cannot justify it. Do not do it.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
894	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Penticton, British Columbia	Building the Aurora LNG Plant on Digby Island is simply wrong. We should be investing in clean energy, not building plants that will increase CO2 emissions. Humans are responsible for climate change, building this will make life worse, not better. And when we know better, we must do better	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act..
895	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Mansons Landing, British Columbia	The proposed building site is too close to human habitation and the island contains a unique ecosystem of wet lands that should be protected, not developed. No to Aurora LNG on Digby Island. Absolutely NOT	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
896	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Creston, British Columbia	Our planet can take no more. The air the land and the water are all suffering from our tax dollars subsidizing fossil fuels. Why won't our politicians spend our money more wisely, oh ya they take banko for themselves.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

897	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Digby Island, British Columbia	<p>Though I am sure more information will be released after the Environmental Assessment is complete, my official position on this project is already one of opposition. First of all, the proposed terminal is only half a kilometre away from the community of Dogde Cove and 3 km away from Prince Rupert. The Society of International Gas and Tanker Terminal Operators states that all LNG facilities and carriers should be at least 3.5 km away from communities. Is this because there is something toxic about the processing of LNG that could harm communities or because it is extremely disruptive in terms of noise/construction/waste etc?</p> <p>Either way, besides the fact that the proposed design is already too close to near by communities (based the standards of the SIGTTO), I do not believe that a project which threatens the area with noise, destruction of natural features, toxic waste, and increased vehicle/marine traffic, etc. should be anywhere near such a pristine, beautiful, diverse and fragile area like the Skeena Estuary, which is home to many species that are endangered or nearing that status. In fact, by contrast, this area would be perfect for a conservation project (see the Wetland area within the proposed site, for example).</p> <p>An LNG terminal could also have a devastating impact on sustainable industries of the area (ex. fishing and tourism), and it is completely unfair that locals who depend on the SUSTAINABLE abundance of the area to support themselves in this way be threatened by a destructive project that benefits mostly the company building it and it's Asia-Pacific trade relations. The healthy salmon population alone brings in millions of dollars every year for the people there which would be massively impacted by an industrial project in the estuary.</p> <p>Last but not least, why would BC continue investing in projects like these, that we know are not only bad for our environment because they require destroying incredibly important and diverse areas in order to build, but which also would add millions of tonnes of CO2 to our atmosphere when we know we need to find alternative means of clean energy that do not do this? Investing money in these LNG projects and granting them permits to build is a huge waste of time and money that should be going into finding other, cleaner, more sustainable and lasting means of producing energy and economic growth. For those reasons and more, I am prepared to oppose the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project and others like it on the coast of BC should they be approved. This is not the time or place for such illogical and destructive industries.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
898	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Victoria, British Columbia	<p>Hello,</p> <p>With respect, I ask you to stop the plans for the Digby island project. It is not acceptable to place this project on this territory, which is within 3km of the Prince Rupert and 0.5 km from the Dodge Cove community. The location of this plant violates the condition that all LNG facilities must be 3.5km away from a community. It is not acceptable to proceed with this project despite British Columbians pleas to re-consider. This is not an acceptable project location. I stand alongside the community and do not consent to this. Thank you for your attention and consideration of this life-altering decision. In honour of the next 7 generations of life on this planet, thank you for stopping the progression of this project.</p> <p>With gratitude.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
899	2017-03-01	Ian Wachs - British Columbia	<p>There is no way an area this pristine should be put in jeopardy or completely destroyed in the name of non renewable energy. The fact the plant would only be around for 30 years makes even less sense. This is the last watershed of it's kind and it should be left untouched for ever so generations can enjoy it. The money should be invested in renewables</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
900	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Toronto, Ontario	<p>Why is the Government so hellbent on ignoring the terrible track-record of leaks in pipelines? Sure, the companies portray their rates as low, but when you actually dig into the data, there is a large amount of oil and natural gas that leaks into the environment. This is old, dirty technology. If BC wants to show leadership, start by looking forward towards new energy sources instead of backward to this project. It's a no-brainer!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
901	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - British Columbia	<p>This project is great. Bring on good jobs!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>
902	2017-03-01	Robin Pozer - Haida Gwaii, British Columbia	<p>Trudeau...preaches global environmental health with Canada leading the way and then does this. The snub to to the West again and reveals his his mismanagement of our country's wellness and culture for short term profit...if any</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>



903 (1 of 3)	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Community of Dodge Cove Personal Impact Statement</p> <p>Digby Island Culture and Quality of Life Dodge Cove is a community of over one hundred years situated on the east side of Digby Island. We contribute the founder of our community to George Dodge- a significant Canadian surveyor of the Northwest coast and the Alaska-BC International Boundary Line. George Dodge set up his surveyor's camp at Fairview Bay in 1910, which is directly across from Dodge Cove. In 1911, the Marine Station was built on the south side of Casey Cove as a means of protection for mariners and Canadians. In about 1911-12 with the expectation of immigrants and industry, a Hospital was built on Dodge Island locally known as Hospital Island. A compatible Dr.'s House was built on the south side of the cove and a bridge connected the two structures. By the 1920's many Norwegian settlers found this as a perfect place for their industry and their families. Industry revolved around fishing, sawmilling, and boatbuilding as well as other spinoffs from this industry. Dodge Cove was also used as place for recreation and the appreciation of its beaches and beauty, because when the hospital fell into disuse very quickly, significant outdoor parties were held at the hospital. To this day Dodge or Hospital Island is a part of our existence as well as the trail that skirts Casey Cove Beach. It is a loop from our road along the beach to the Dr.'s House and either to the top of CBC Hill or past the Dr's House on the south side of the Cove back to the main road. The trails that begin in our community and extend out from it are all maintained on a volunteer basis. Trails that lead anywhere are a significant part of our unique existence on this island as they all have many uses. There are trails that lead to the ridge behind our properties that take us to the Dodge Cove dam, the ponds, Mt. Comblain and Wahl Lake. There are so many trails we have used for hunting, photography, wild food gathering, and recreation that it would be difficult to describe all of them. In the last ten years two tsunami trails have been built. One is mid Dodge Cove and one is at the north end of Dodge Cove. A trail leads northward to Crippen Cove partially under the power lines that lead to the airport. There has been a very close connection between these two communities. A trail leads to Delusion Bay from one of the creeks on the south side of Casey Cove. Residents walk the beach to access the trail for hunting and recreation purposes. A Cabin there attests to the fact that it has had many visitors. There is cabin near southwest beach as Spire Ledge is a famous fishing spot. Beaches there and on the west side are used for recreation and log beach combing and boats and kayaks use the whole island for circumnavigation. There are local businesses that rely on log salvaging and fishing as well as boat building and photography. These will be negatively impacted by the plant in the heart of our island and from the jetties at the south end. Many mariners run out to Spire ledge and the sound to watch the whales in the winter. That will come to an end also. As a property owner, I will not want to hike to the back of my property and hike the ridge to Bhudda Hill because there will be a camp from 1000 to 5000 of mostly men workers. I will not be going to bring my guests to see the view to the west. I will not be bringing guests or family to see Spire rocks, to whale watch or to fish. My family will not be able to hike to Delusion Bay to birdwatch, hunt, or photograph. My guests and family will be cut off from Lake Wahl, named after a famous boatbuilder that lived and created industry in Dodge Cove for most of his life. At Frederick point are the remains of the Old Fort where even socials were held during the war. Again this was a significant spot for defense of our harbour.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
903 (2 of 3)	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Where there should be safety for all those entering the harbour, for fisherman, tugboat operators, captains, ferries with tourists and all local people, instead there will be ground zero of a Hazard Range which, due to a malfunction or leak, could take the lives of all people and animals within a 2.2 mile radius (Sandia National Laboratories). An old road runs from Frederick Point along the east side of Digby Island which was built during the war. Will I feel safe and secure for myself, my visitors or my family walking the beach to the Boy Scout Camp for berry picking or nettles? Of course not. Who would want to walk closer to the hazard in a hazard zone? Will I be allowed to hike the island either south or west of Dodge Cove? Of course not! If this is not safe for me then it is not safe for others. That is why it is called a Hazard Zone. What really angers me is that Canada has not given any thought to the hazards that exist in letting the Chinese Government/ Nationally Owned Company buy a strategic inland wharf (where a Marine Base was built) and that they have acquired by lease from the Provincial government, an island that is most important for the protection and security of the Prince Rupert World Port and the Prince Rupert Airport. Obviously the importance of marine travel and ports for the protection of Canadians is at its lowest point.</p> <p>All the spaces in between these important places are just as important as the trails because without the health of the soil, the water and the air, then who would want to gather the food. It will be contaminated. If the fresh water habitat, the bog habitat and the fish habitat are sick then the health of the people will fail. The environmental application does not consider the sedimentation of our bog or streams from construction and how it will affect our drinking water, nor does it consider the acidification or eutrophication of our community water even though the changes due to green house gases will be significant. This LNG process will produce over 20% of BC's green house gases with upstream emissions. Of course Nexen-CNOOC has not put in their upstream emissions yet and they won't have to until much of the work on the application is finished. The application is a disguise for the truth as there are many missing parts that the public or the working group has not seen yet.</p> <p>When I go to the sacred places, such as Bhudda Hill, the highest point on the island, where visitors leave offerings for their loved ones who have passed on and we look to the west, there will be no buffer zone and no visual quality left as Nexen claims. Before the Panoramic Pacific view there will be a workers camp with the noise and industry of the LNG trains and generators and the three lane highway which will overlap our Official Community Plan. One reason the OCP is so important to all communities is to protect watersheds so communities have the right to life...water. We rely on the water just as it comes from the natural uncontaminated bog. The construction of the highway and all else related to Aurora LNG will irreversibly degenerate the quality of life on Digby Island.</p> <p>All the spaces in between all the trails holds our green space, our water, our air and all other living things which are imbedded in the psyche of everyone who has ever lived on this island or visited it. Because of the beauty and the unique culture of the people, the island is a hotspot for artists and photographers. The Cove has had a few schools, three of which are still standing. The last school has been renovated to be the Community Centre. Many organizations work from this Centre. The old outdoor basketball court was has been used as a stage for musicians during The Dodge Cove Art Show. There is the Dodge Cove Arts Guild, the Digby Island Arts Group, The Coastal Quilters, and the Dodge Cove Recreation Society that depend upon the School for events and functions. The Recreation Society, the Dodge Cove Improvement District and the Dodge Cove Harbour Authority use the School's offices. The computers serve the public and mariners. The DC Authority maintains the dock and structures while the DCID maintains the Dodge Cove Dam and the Community Water.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

903 (3 of 3)	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>With the construction of Aurora, the beauty and sacred places will be gone, and with them the naturalists, artists and travellers who have come over the hundred years of our existence to reap not only the benefits of our backdoor wilderness but the commercial aspects also, whether it is the craftsman on the waterfront or the artisans who seek the history and wild places. All of it will be gone, because as go the fish, so go the fishermen, with the fishermen gone the boatsheds the builders/craftsmen will be gone. Our unique culture, of potlucks at the Schoolhouse, Santa Clause and Christmases, Winter Solstice celebrations at Casey Cove, Halloween costume parties, the Dodge Cove Art Shows and home cooked Easter Brunches where over one hundred visitors come to celebrate, not the event, but the location will dwindle or disappear. New Year Dances, Canada Day barbecues and First Fish Barbecues at Casey Cove North Beach will all be gone because this Island will not be suitable to the health of populations. These events are all part of our diverse make up and tight knit community. It is my community and I have realized over the years how a community is built and how a community remains healthy. Part of my family's income will be affected as artists' interest in Dodge Cove dies as the beauty is destroyed. Many Dodge Cove citizens gain income from their art. As fishing and tourism decreases, and our population decreases on the island it will affect income from boat repairs that is part of income in my family also.</p> <p>The dredging and floating camp will ruin not only the fish and bird and beaches of Casey Cove but will ruin the wilderness and relatively quiet beach where residents and visitors go for stress free walks and where school children learn about beach habitat. The GHG emissions and methane have known carcinogens, the Hazard Zone has its own explosive dangers and anyone would have to think more than twice about raising children here. Why have the proponent, the provincial and federal governments allowed this aggressive invasion on a population? The safe and secure community with access only by the water will be gone as a complete abnormal town within a fence, with one purpose, will be built behind us in our green space. We love the physical activity of walking hiking, skating on Wahl Lake, outdoor barbecues, fishing, birdwatching, toad observations, gardening, messing about with boats and family life. I live here because the ocean is in front of me and the wilderness is behind as I know others in my community do. The volunteerism and cohesion of this very old style traditional way of life will pass by. This is a community with a very small footprint. We have no trucks and cars. We should be the model for everyone who cares about a better quality of life and a reduction of greenhouse gases. This island is my health but it is also a part of the health of Prince Rupert and its citizens.</p> <p>Is this not more important for us to exist and live in a healthy lifestyle in a secure location, to show Canada that this traditional style community still has more relevance than a project of environmental destruction? In fact, shouldn't Canada depend on this less is more way of life? Didn't Canada make this commitment in Paris? LESS IS MORE. Aurora LNG obviously is much more and is a commitment of more GHG'S until 2050, long after the world's temperature has risen 1.5 degrees.</p>	
904	2017-03-01	natalie gosnell - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I don't think LNG is very considerate of what actually happens when they come into unknown territory and just start building and operating. I was born and raised in Prince Rupert, I live in Vancouver now. I've seen both sides of the work spectrum. In Vancouver its all about money, profit, "success". In Rupert it's different. It's about the spiritual and emotional success the land provides us, NATURALLY. Financial stability comes with it and is our bonus ! Our culture, the way we raise our children in Prince Rupert and surrounding areas are largely based off the land and all it has to offer us.</p> <p>How would you feel if you are living a happy life with your family and one day someone says "I don't like the way you are living, and I think the way I do things is going to profit you" ... You would disagree, or unwillingly agree ? With the facts that you know about how your family works and survives, you would defiantly disagree. My name is Natalie, I am from Haida Gwaii, eagle clam, Ts'aahl laanaas Clan is my house name. I more the strongly disagree with LNG and what they promise to offer. "More Jobs" mean nothing in a community like ours. We are one of the few communities in BC, the world, that don't abide by the concrete jungle world. Now I don't believe in God but I do believe what is "right" for the world.</p> <p>Let us keep our mostly unharmed environment. Let me grow as a person in this money hungry world until I am ready to move home and raise a family. Let me raise my future children in the same environment as I have. My future children's lives would be so different. They will not see the beauty of a high tide, and all the silver fish brushed along the top of the water. They will not hear the convocation of eagles living across my parents house. Or be able to catch the perfect salmon off the water front docks. Or to smell the scent off fresh cut yellow cedar on a hot summer day. Dried or smoked salmon will be a thing of the past. My comfortable and happy life style at home will drastically change.</p> <p>Life isn't always about making money and buying things. Life is about what you do with your time and how you effect the people and world surrounding you. It took me many years to realize this. And I wish the corporate at LNG would realize to. I can say a million more valid points but I would rather not bore you with a email no one will read or reply. I feel hopeless typing this. I am crying thinking of the negative impact this will have against our people .... Destroy another communitiy, belief and culture built with mother nature. Not mine. Please. STOP !</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
905	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I have a number of concerns about the Proposed Aurora LNG Project slated for Digby Island. Among them are:</p> <p>1- Navigable Waters: I am very concerned about the increased congestion at the mouth of the Prince Rupert harbour the construction of this facility will engender. There is a large volume of traffic already, and, as a mariner, I have experienced the need to get to the side of the channel when a freighter, ferry or cruise ship is entering or leaving the harbour. The Port of Prince Rupert has greatly expanded the use of the Port, with the container shipping terminal at Fairview, the pellet-loading facility mid-harbour, the export of raw logs (which apparently is at an all-time high) and the anchoring of freighters awaiting berth at the coal, grain and other facilities. Some of these facilities are slated for expansion with a corresponding increase in shipping, docking tugs and patrol vessels. Building a large jetty that will accommodate 2 LNG tankers at full build out, right at the south-eastern entrance of the harbour seems folly to me.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the use of these waters by small vessels: day-fishers, commuters to the communities on Porcher Island (Hunts Inlet and Oona River), log salvagers, kayakers and canoeists, recreational boaters out for a spin and a walk on the beach....The necessary security perimeters and docking and turning radius for the extremely large LNG carriers will impede and imperil all of this traffic.</p> <p>In addition to this concern regarding the other traffic that traverses these already busy waters, at a restricted point, are concerns regarding weather at this site. Opportunely, in a dispatch released yesterday (February 28, 2017) the National Research Council avers that:</p> <p>"In response to the increase of extreme weather events, the National Research Council is developing measures to keep Canadians safe</p> <p>February 28, 2017 – Ottawa, - Canadian buildings and infrastructure are being more and more challenged by the impacts of climate change and an increase in extreme weather events such as damaging floods and devastating high winds. In response to this new reality, the National Research Council (NRC) along with Infrastructure Canada is upgrading codes, specifications, guidelines, and assessment tools to keep Canadians safe.</p> <p>"With Climate change, the total annual precipitation is increasing, as well as the frequency and severity of extreme events, such as heat waves, high winds, floods, and droughts, all of which is resulting in increased stress on built structures," says Richard Tremblay, General Manager of Construction at the National Research Council of Canada."</p> <p>This information and the rest of the dispatch can be viewed at the following link:  <a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/national-research-council/news/2017/02/in_response_to_theincreaseofextremeweathereventsthenationalresea.html">https://www.canada.ca/en/national-research-council/news/2017/02/in_response_to_theincreaseofextremeweathereventsthenationalresea.html</a></p> <p>Are standards going to change even as structures like these extremely large LNG facility are being built? As a mariner, who made my living for over three decades on boats up and down the Coast and all around the Haida Gwaii, I am very concerned about a facility built in an area subject to very large tides, very strong winds, and large waves that build in a long fetch, in an area of uncertain geologic stability in reference to earthquakes. In our area, we have repeatedly been asked to come up with Emergency Evacuation Plans and Supplies in the case of a tsunami. Dodge Cove had a number of meetings with local disaster planning authorities and has done it's due diligence in this matter. If Dodge Cove is supposed to be prepared for tsunamis in the harbour, what risks are inherent outside the protected waters, at the harbour mouth, I have to wonder?</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>

906	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>2- The loss of Recreational and Traditional Use of the Areas the LNG facility will take over: The areas that the Aurora LNG plant will remove from use are numerous, both marine and terrestrial. The City of Prince Rupert has already lost a lot of access to waterfront for recreational use, both inside and outside the city limits (along the CN property, at the site of the pellet plant, out towards Ridley Island etc...) Many Rupertites and tourists use Digby Island for recreation: accessing from Metlakatla Pass but also all around the Island. Dodge Cove residents have often used the beaches in Delusion Bay, at Lima Point and at Tremayne Bay, as well along the northern and western perimeters. The removal of Delusion Bay and adjacent waters and beaches is an enormous loss.</p> <p>For Dodge Cove residents, the building of the Materials Offloading facility and other structures in Casey Cove effectively industrializes that area, that is in daily use and important in community gatherings and celebrations. That areas is also much used by Rupertites who come over on the passenger ferry and in their own vessels as day-trippers. This would be an enormous social loss.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The project will not require the use of the private lands of Dodge Cove or Crippen Cove, or access through either of these areas. Based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels.</p> <p>As we work through the assessment and design process, Aurora LNG will continue to look for opportunities to reduce our project's environmental effects and improve operating efficiency through design and engineering practices, the use of technology, and by leveraging the global LNG experience of the project partners.</p>
907	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>3- The Camp for Construction Workers: This camp is slated to accommodate 5000 workers at full capacity, on a very lightly inhabited island. This workforce will be FIFO: Fly In Fly Out, and apparently will be closed in order to allay fears of social and other impacts. I think this is appalling: though I understand that the proponent has plans to deal with the water/sewage/supplies/increased traffic at the airport, I am sceptical that this can be accomplished without a major effect on the Island itself. The promise that I have heard is that all will be restored to a natural state after use. I simply cannot fathom the possibility of that. I am also upset at the proximity of the camp to Wahl Lake, which has been held very close in my, my family's and the community's hearts for decades.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. The assessment included consideration of socio-economic effects as well.</p> <p>A full range of mitigations measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan</li> <li>o Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce.</li> <li>o Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community.</li> <li>o Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community.</li> <li>o Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime.</li> <li>o Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
908	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>4- Changes to the Social Fabric of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove: While acknowledging that change is inevitable, this is change that is being thrust upon small communities of committed residents who ask for little of the government (and I reference our MP Nathan Cullen, who told us that in a meeting),and are self-reliant and resilient, along their own cultural structures. Both communities rely on volunteers to keep the small infrastructure going and a heavily invested in the stability and maintenance of these communities.</p> <p>I believe that these communities, particularly Dodge Cove, by its proximity, will bear the brunt of any "adverse effects" from the LNG facility without any benefits, and that the proponent's seeking of social license does not apply to these communities whatsoever. I hold the provincial government, in its indifference to the fate of these communities, to blame.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. We are committed to being a vibrant member of the community and we strive to have a positive impact in the communities where we work.</p>
909	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>5- Harvesting of Food: Local food is an important value of mine and my family has subsisted in large part on the food we grow, harvest in the wild and trade for. The most important of these, in terms of the Aurora LNG facility, is the harvesting of wild salmon. This is the most important source of protein that we have, and weekly consumption of salmon has been a mainstay for decades. Salmon is always the key element of any local celebration, year round. I am not satisfied that the mitigation measures to make up for the loss of the entire south-eastern side of Digby Island to migrating and schooling salmon are effective. I am also concerned about the impact to the small salmon spawning streams that are vulnerable to disturbance.</p> <p>The salmon runs associated with the Skeena River are perhaps the most important economic and cultural resource in the North-west, and impacts to those populations have repercussions on communities all the way to the Babine, as well to important commercial fisheries.</p> <p>Along with the concerns over the effect cause by divergence of the salmon who traverse the area are concerns about the sea grass habitat. This habitat is under study locally: it has been mapped and identified, up to a point, but I don't believe that all of the science is in yet. Some of the latest studies globally concern the importance of this habitat for juvenile fish (especially salmon, in our area) and many other species, but also underscore the importance of sea grass as bio-filters for pollutants and bacteria. The anti-bacterial mechanisms are newly-identified and under study. Latest scientific studies also estimate that this important ecosystem is being lost at a rate of 7% globally per annum. This is of great concern to me, globally and locally.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
910	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>6-Light and Noise Pollution: Light: In Dodge Cove, despite our lack of amenities like streetlights and our liking for a naturally dark environment, we are already subjected to a lot of light from the expansion of the container port. I don't need a flashlight to walk outside at night, and have to screen my windows as from a streetlight. I am concerned about increased light from the expansion of the container Port and vastly increased "sky glow" from the proposed Aurora LNG plant, including the installations in Casey Cove.</p> <p>Noise: Once again, due to our proximity to the container port and the other shipping in the harbour, we have noticed a vastly increased level of noise; it's like living next to thunderstorm. The noise pollution from the helicopters used 12 hours a day for months on end during the explorations of Digby Island by Nexen, noise that had a hiatus over the winter, but is about to resume made being outside quite onerous. I am very concerned about the increase of noise in what is already a very industrial industrial environment, and am not satisfied that the science concerning acceptable threshold has taken into account the entire soun scape. When noise keeps one from thinking or sleeping without ear protection, it's already too loud, in my opinion. Dodge Cove itself is quiet, all around us not.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

911	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>7-Wildlife:          There are many important terrestrial and marine species that inhabit Digby Island and adjacent waters. I do not concur that the proposed mitigation strategies are adequate.          I have already mentioned concerns about local populations of salmon but I am also concerned about other fish species that migrate through the area, such as herring, smelt and eulachon.          Delusion Bay and adjacent waters shelter an important population of Harbour porpoise, the smallest cetacean and a relatively shy and little studied species. My understanding is that in some areas of the world, Harbour porpoise are rare and it is thought that the populations are quite localized and not amenable to re-locating. There is an important population around that area of Chatham Sound. The EA identifies irremediable effects on the Harbour porpoise population.          As well, new research into the Humpback whales in Chatham Sound is uncovering the possibility that they overwinter in the area and are dependent on food sources provided by the confluence of the Skeena River with the Sound. Humpback whales are coming back from the brink of extinction, but vigilance is required to enable the population to continue this recovery. They are vulnerable to strikes by ships and dependant on rich food sources, both of which, in my opinion, put them at risk from this development. Whale watching is an increasingly important part of the local tourist economy, which while nowhere near promising the revenues that LNG develop does, is sustainable, environmentally responsible, and affords good local jobs for stable residents and direct and indirect benefits for small businesses.          I am concerned about the local habitat which is fragile, as are all wetlands and bogs. The proponent has contracted to return all to an approximation of the existing ecosystem once the life of the plant is expired. This is a completely bogus and unrealistic expectation, and I have had company officials admit to me that this will not happen, though it is a requirement and there is a plan in place (though there have been different iterations of that plan produced: not surprising, giving that I think it an impossibility.)          There are other blue-listed species like the Northwestern toad that inhabit the wetlands, as well as other birds such as Marbled murrelets and amphibians such as the Northwestern salamander that biologists have flagged as inadequately accounted for and studied in the EA.          While I am not a biologist, even I found many lacunae in the EA as pertains to wildlife. Wolverines were listed as 0 (in Dodge Cove, we have seen wolverines); Wilson's snipe also 0 (we have many around our community and cannot imagine they would not be using suitable habitat elsewhere on the island); little or no mention of Sandhill crane even though we have seen increasing numbers migrating and using the interior of the Island as resting places (not last year though, which we opine might have to do with the amount of helicopter traffic). I am not a biologist, but if even I can find these lapses so easily, I am led to question what else was missed. The time-lines for studies were quick and inadequate, there is no provision for baseline studies or long-term follow up. Every year is different and a species that doesn't appear in one year can be abundant in another: any lay-person knows that, it seems to me.          Therefor the biological studies seem like so much window-dressing to me. Studies done, species present at the time noted, conclusions drawn, done.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects          Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p>
912	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>8-Quality of the Science Used in the EA:          I have many concerns about the quality of the science being used in these very large Environmental Assessments. I understand that the EAO and all the concerned government ministries and agencies, as well as numerous other interest groups and stakeholders work very hard to provide complete documents with all concerns listed and ultimately addressed. But the requirements for the kind and quality of the scientific studies to answer to those concerns are often criticized by experts versed in the areas under study. The proponent, who foots the bill, has a vested interest in science that will support the go-ahead. I am not accusing anyone of falsifying information, but certainly the methods, time-lines, weight given to conclusions and results have been under fire by scientists and other experts.          To my mind, the studies lack reference to accepted study standards and impartial oversight. The company paid for the science which was produced quickly and the development, if approved, is slated to be up and running soon. Medical experts have been very critical of the Air-shed study (which is proprietary information, another huge problem in my opinion), the revisions it underwent when deemed inadequate (what new science actually went in) and of the conclusions drawn that the potential health effects are within the acceptable thresholds. Those experts have also been critical of the science used in determining the health effects on affected populations. Those include not only the communities on Digby Island, but all the population downwind.          Not all the requested documents were available to the working group or the public at the time the EA, with its inexorable time-lime was launched, despite the best efforts on the Draft AIR document.          Biologists have questioned the methods used for population studies.          Other experts have found very many lacunae that the proponent must address within a short time frame, generating more writing, palliation and, in my opinion, verbiage. Proprietary science is suspect; science produced and written about by students, without expert oversight is suspect (an over-read is not enough in my opinion); science with a short study period, not conducted at the right time or repeated is suspect; science with short timeline and a tight deadline is suspect; science produced without adequate baselines is suspect. It appears that at least some (if not all given that the project is in its infancy) of the science used in the Aurora EA can be this characterized.          The proponent has produced an incredible volume of material, much of it well-written, but, to my mind, thin on substance. Lastly, to my mind, mitigation is often a poor measure that allows the inevitability of the degradation and monitoring is no mitigation at all.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects          Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p>
913	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>9- The Right to a Healthy Environment, not addressed in the Environmental Assessment process:          This comment acts as a sort of footnote, as British Columbia lacks, along with many other Environmental Standards, any code regarding the Right to a Healthy Environment. The United Nations is drafting a resolution making the Right to a Healthy Environment an inalienable human right.          (<a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Environment/SREnvironment/Pages/SREnvironmentIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Environment/SREnvironment/Pages/SREnvironmentIndex.aspx</a>)          I can imagine that such a resolution is difficult to craft, having very far-reaching implications. But even so, there are countries around the world enshrining and working on legislation to just this end: the protection of environments and citizenry. This idea, that human health is inextricably linked to a healthy environment is increasingly gaining global traction. I subscribe to this idea which inevitably leads me to oppose large-scale industrial development which despoliates the environment for what appear to me largely suspect gains. Who in the end really profits and who pays the price?          Of course, I am particularly invested in opposing this development, with its implications of far-reaching and potentially devastating consequences for my home, community and an environment that is beloved to me. I do not view that as unreasonable.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG is in undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects          Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated.</p>

914	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I would like to submit these letters sent to the Environmental Assessment Office to the public comments, as they speak to the EA process</p> <p><b>(NOTE: first letter, dated January 12, 2017)</b></p> <p>RE: launch of Aurora LNG Environmental Assessment, advertisement in Northern View newspaper, January 11, 2017</p> <p>I, along with most of the residents of Dodge Cove, have been very distressed and overwhelmed throughout dealing with the new reality of the proposed Aurora LNG Project on Digby Island, as you know. Part of that, along with trying to communicate our concerns and questions to the Provincial Government, local governments, the proponent Nexen-CNOOC, etc has been trying to understand the Process (and I capitalize advisedly).</p> <p>I, along with others, appreciated the meeting you held with us in Dodge Cove to explain the EAO process (though I have to say that it left me thoroughly disheartened and aware of just how toothless the whole exercise really is).</p> <p>But I saw red, and continue to find myself quite furious whenever I think of the fact that in your recent advertisement to the Open House and Invitation to Comment in the newspaper, NOWHERE DO YOU MENTION DODGE COVE. We have been completely invisible from the start and continue to be, in every official interaction. Your description of the location of the proposed plant is: "the southeast corner of Digby Island near Prince Rupert". No one would ever guess anyone lived there. This is indicative of how we have been treated from the start.</p> <p>No one told us the plant was proposed or that an application for a License for Investigative Use was in the works (we found out by accident from online blogs). No one from the Provincial Government has ever answered a letter. We had to press for a seat on the Working Group of the EAO. We have been told that we aren't eligible for funding for reviewing and commenting on the very lengthy Environmental Assessment Application documents, although other communities, some very much farther away, are. We have been left out of meetings concerning land-use planning on the Island, resulting in rumors of back-room deals. We have had our Official Community Plan (OCP) ignored, with no notice or comment.</p> <p>Yes, company officials, our provincial MLA and federal MP, and members of your office have met with us, usually after the fact. But, mostly, we are lumped in with the public at large, even though our tiny, historic community is by far the closest and most affected settlement. Every scrap of attention we have had, we have fought for. This seems like more of the same.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.
915	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>(NOTE: second letter, dated February 9, 2017)</p> <p>Last night I attended the Open House and Invitation to Comment hosted in Prince Rupert at the Moose Hall by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) to present the Environmental Assessment (EA )for the Proposed Aurora LNG Project. (I understand that this EA is being conducted by the BC-EAO for itself and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (C-EAA), by the substitution process. )</p> <p>I was very upset to see the very large presence that the proponent Nexen Energy ULC had at the Open House. I had been under the impression that the EAO, as hosts, were going to be explaining the EA process to the general public, including how to comment. EA employees were indeed present, and there was a small table at the entrance with a handout and cards directing the public to the website for posting comments. But this presence was very largely overshadowed by the many posters supplied by the proponent laying out key points in the EA, along with the company's planned mitigation strategy, and very many Nexen employees eager to answer questions and provide information. There was a large laminated photo of a project in a completely different location, perhaps even a different country: I couldn't bring myself to look at it, though I diligently read every poster and conversed with one Nexen employee, who when he heard that I am from Dodge Cove, commiserated with me by telling me that he lives out in the country in Alberta, with a great view, and he sure wouldn't want this kind of development next to him.</p> <p>This Open House is taking place while the EA is under review by a large working group of federal and provincial ministries and agencies, along with other interest groups such as the PR Port Authority and Health Authorities etc and First Nations. None of this reviewing was apparent in the displays. The public commenting period was barely underway. But with the extremely potent forum the proponent was given to advertise and reassure, this was far from the impression the public would receive.</p> <p>In the interest of impartiality . at the least, the opponents to the project should have been given equal opportunity to present material expressing their viewpoints. Better yet, no interest groups should have been present, only the EAO, if the intent is indeed to engage the public in an impartial process. In my opinion, the EAO appears partisan not impartial, when partnered in this highly-visible public forum with a proponent.</p> <p>I became quite upset and expressed my strong opinion to an EAO employee who answered me blandly, and so I expressed myself again to you, Sean. You encouraged me to write, hence this letter.</p> <p>In conclusion, I would like to report on two conversations I had with people who attended the Open House. One, a man who has never been to any Open House for a proposed industrial project, left convinced that the project was "a done deal" (he had no opinion one way or the other, just felt that, yes this was sure to go ahead, judging by the maps etc...). The other, a woman who opposes the project, an intelligent professional woman with a managerial position and three academic degrees, told me that she didn't know that there was a difference between the EA and the Nexen employees ("just a lot of people with name-tags"): she ended up leaving in great distress at the slickness of the presentation.</p> <p>Paint me increasingly cynical...and bitterly disappointed.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.

916	2017-03-01	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(NOTE: third letter, dated February 20, 2017)</b></p> <p>I have written two indignant letters lately regarding the way the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) engages with the public, as evidenced by the Environmental Assessment (EA) process for the Proposed Aurora LNG Project for Digby Island.</p> <p>In one (January 12), I objected to not having the village of Dodge Cove, where I reside, mentioned in the newspaper advertisement (and, actually, in the descriptions in the EA itself).</p> <p>In the second (February 9), I criticized the perceived tacit endorsement of the project by the EAO hosting an Open House and presenting the EA to the public in partnership with Nexen ULC, allowing the proponent to have such a commanding presence.</p> <p>Since those letters were redacted, I have continued to read and study: the EA itself, as I have time- it's massive and I am not an expert; the 40 page booklet provided by the proponent at the Open House (citing on the first page that the BC-EAO is the host- along with an invitation to comment and a promise that Nexen will be providing responses); 40 pages of advertisement, complete with beautiful photos, not all taken on Digby Island, and computer-generated sanitized imagery; the full-page article published in the Northern View newspaper of February 15th, wherein the EAO received one sentence mid-article (not that the EAO is responsible for that journalists write, but the showcase Nexen got, with multiple quotes from Andrew Hamilton, Aurora Project Manager, underscores my point). In my view, none of this serves the perception that the EA process is neutral.</p> <p>The community of Dodge Cove has thought that the EA is neutral and unbiased. That is the reason that we were so surprised and indignant when the EAO asked to bring the proponent to the workshop held in Dodge Cove on February 9th. We refused, because we felt that we would gain a better understanding of the process without the proponent in the room. We were mildly chastised for that stance, which arose from our understanding of the process. But we were grateful and helped in our understanding of the process by meeting with the EAO employees who came to our community.</p> <p>At the February 9th workshop, you (Sean Moore) told us that the process is sometimes disappointing for people who engage, as a "comment is not a vote". I take your point: I never thought that it was, though I know that people who feel strongly about their position find it emotionally difficult to not get the agreement they seek. My quarrel with the process is not that it doesn't guarantee agreement, but that the process itself appears skewed. Is it possible that by pointing out lacunae in the EA, we are actually helping the proponent strengthen their position, which is at antipodes from ours? Are we doing all this work to help them provide yet more blandishments as answers: "mitigation"; "monitoring"; "finding no effects"; "positive relationships with communities"? What about poor science and legitimate concerns that the proponent seems to be ducking and weaving around?</p> <p>As well, I personally do not hold faith in a process that can be so easily set aside by a political agenda- and, by that, I mean no disrespect to the hard-working, intelligent, honest and seemingly caring EAO employees that I have met, yourself among them. I am losing however faith at the dichotomy between the rhetoric of neutrality and the perceived actuality of the workings. More and more, I opine that the process facilitates the way for the proponent. My indignation already seems naïve, as I become more cynical and sad about it all. I sincerely hope to be proved wrong.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.
917	2017-03-01	Anne Moeller - Charleston	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Anne Moeller</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
918	2017-03-01	Deirdre Keohane, Vancouver	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Deirdre Keohane</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
919	2017-03-01	Elaina Valzania, Greenland	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Your industry supporting Gas is a disasterous idea since it will destroy Salmon and water and contaminate air and earth. All of life needs clean air and water to survive and with the annihilation of all of our environment all living species are soon to follow. We cannot keep destroying the air and water and expect to live healthy lives and if you have families you care about they should take priorities over profits. Once the damage is done we can never go back.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Elaina Valzania</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
920	2017-03-01	Annie Wei, Queensland	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Annie Wei, Queenslnad</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
921	2017-03-01	Shirley Mills, Sandwell	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The proposed fracked gas plant on Digby Island is to dangerous.The local community and up to a billion young salmon will be put at risk.</p> <p>The terminals burning gases will be a threat to migrating birds.</p> <p>This is not the place for such a dangerous plant.</p> <p>Please reconsider.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>shirley mills, sandwell</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
922	2017-03-01	Antonio Garcia-Palao Redondo, Madrid	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I say no to Aurora LNG</p> <p>It is a question of love and care to the planet</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Antonio Garcia-Palao Redondo, Madrid</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
923	2017-03-01	Bonna Mettie, Paradise	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Bonna Mettie, Paradise</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.

924	2017-03-01	Ludger Wilp, Bottrop	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ludger Wilp, Bottrop cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
925	2017-03-01	Ruth Cain, Clearwater	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Ruth Cain, Clearwater cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
926	2017-03-01	Diana Disney-Cokey, Mars Hill	Dear EAO, This would be insane. Don't let big oil (especially China!) enrich themselves while poisoning wild areas and the wildlife that lives there. All the money in the world is not worth this destruction. Sincerely, Diana Disney-Coker, Mars Hill cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
927	2017-03-01	Lisa Neste, High Point	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Lisa Neste, High point cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
928	2017-03-01	Patricia Erwin, Duluth	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Patricia Erwin, Duluth cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
929	2017-03-01	Roz Isaac, North Vancouver	Dear EAO, It's time to put aside monetary interests and do the right thing for the environment for future generations, particularly in the First Nations communities. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. Sincerely, Roz Isaac, North Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
930	2017-03-01	Erica Pinsky, Vancouver, BC	British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office I am writing to express my absolute opposition to the Auroran LNG proposal. I am opposed to any new LNG projects in our province, as research and the experience here in BC and in states south of the border shows that in addition to the habitat destruction, environmental devastation, water contamination and massive use of our limited water resource, without which life on this planet will not be sustainable, there is a documented increase in earthquake risk and frequency. With respect to Aurora LNG, putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents. My understanding is that Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic. From an environmental perspective the noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. In addition, Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island. Perhaps most significantly Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets. This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. It is clear that such a project is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions. I respectfully ask your office and the current government of BC to please say no to this project which will put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk! cc: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
931	2017-03-01	G. Loewen, Vancouver	Dear EAO, Save our coastline, salmon, and keep our water clean. We should not jeopardize our beautiful coastline, the Eco system, and our water for the sake of big business. LNG is still a form of fossil fuel and not sustainable. Sincerely, G Loewen, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
932	2017-03-01	Dave Deleurme, Kelowna	Dear EAO, I want to add my voice in opposition to the proposed Aurora LNG. We need to put a stop to large multinational corporations destroying our natural habitats for the sake of profits. LNG is an expensive, unnecessary endeavour. The government should say no to this massive boondoggle. Sincerely, Dave Deleurme, Kelowna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

933	2017-03-01	Beverley Playfair - Fort St. James, BC	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office, RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>I have spent 12 years in this area out on a boat. This is the last place in BC that should have this LNG plant. The people who live on this tiny Island have been there for years for a purpose they want to leave a clean quiet life. What is the pollution going to do to this area? This is Prince Rupert on the North Coast of BC where it rains and is foggy and socked in 325 days of the year. I invite anyone or all of you responsible for this decision to visit this area and then make your decision.</p> <p>Thank you. Beverley Playfair Fort St. James, BC Thank you cc: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
934	2017-03-01	Raleigh Koritz, Plymouth	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Raleigh koritz, Plymouth cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
935	2017-03-02	Isabel Cervera, Madrid	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, ISABEL CERVERA, Madrid cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
936	2017-03-02	Michelle Elliot, Sydney	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, michelle elliot, sydney cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
937	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Interior, British Columbia	<p>Why is a project of this magnitude, crossing watersheds and multiple areas of concern for aquatic and riparian species, being shoved down locals throats when the future state of the environment is so uncertain? Once this is constructed, it cannot be undone. We are running out of natural landscapes in BC, and we will not be able to buy back ecosystem health.</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
938 (1 of 2)	2017-03-02	Metis Nation British Columbia	<p>Metis Nation British Columbia (MNBC) represents over 15,000 citizens in British Columbia. Metis citizens of British Columbia desire sustainable use of their natural resources which includes: managing natural resources to meet present needs without compromising the needs of future generations; providing stewardship of natural resources based on an ethic of respect for the land; balancing economic, productive, spiritual, ecological and traditional values of natural resources to meet the economic, social and cultural needs of the Metis peoples and other aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities; conserving biological diversity, soil, water, fish, wildlife, scenic diversity, and other natural resources; and restoring damaged ecologies. All of these may be significantly impacted by the proposed project.</p> <p>MNBC interests in this environmental assessment are to protect the sustenance and cultural needs of the Metis citizens and ensure adequate consultation has been undertaken. Further, that Metis rights and traditional land uses are taken into consideration, that where possible the impacts to these rights and uses are minimized and where not possible, mitigation measures are employed.</p> <p><i>Appendix S.2 Aboriginal Consultation Section 10 Metis Nation British Columbia</i> 10.3.1 Metis Nation British Columbia is not referred to as Metis this sentence seems incomplete. MNBC represents more than 15,000 citizens. Table 10-2: Nicola Valley &amp; District Metis Society is in Merritt. Kelowna Metis Association is in Kelowna. Columbia Valley Metis Association is in Invermere. Elk Valley Metis Association is in Fernie. Rocky Mountain Metis Association is in Cranbrook. North East Metis Association is in Dawson Creek. Moccasin Flat's Metis Society is located in Chetwynd.</p> <p><i>Aboriginal Consultation Report #2</i> 11.1 Metis Nation British Columbia (the legal name has no "of"). MNBC would prefer to be referenced consistently as Metis Nation British Columbia or MNBC and not as the BC Metis Association for clarity's sake.</p> <p><i>Other Sections</i> This AEAC appropriately identifies the VCs used, the mechanisms by which they were selected, and how impacts were gauged. However, based on a review of the application, we highlight the following short-comings in the AEAC: -There is limited final input on the scale of impact to target species, particularly regarding the Marbled Murrelet (<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>). -The percentages of habitat type lost through the project development versus amount of that habitat type available within the Riparian Assessment Area (RAA) is unclear. The AEAC confirms that Marbled Murrelet are using the marine and terrestrial environments that could be directly impacted by the project, and provides a commitment to including a mitigation plan. The concerns with the application are that some of the mature forest lands on Digby Island provide the unique and specific nesting requirements appropriate for the Marbled Murrelet and there is no indication of the percentage of usable nesting habitat that will be removed. Given the ongoing losses in this species (Cushing et al. 2010) and the continued accelerated loss of their nesting habitat (Mathers et al. 2008), this direct measurement must be considered for cumulative impacts and to ensure Project construction will be in accordance with the <i>Recovery Strategy for the Marbled Murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus) in Canada</i> (Environment Canada 2014). Working around high-risk seasonal windows will help mitigate certain disturbances, but there is no indication that the mitigation plan will seek to maintain nesting habitats or accommodate for losses. This should be clarified prior to the awarding of an EAC.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>The comment identifies "Appendix S.2 Aboriginal Consultation Section 10 Metis Nation British Columbia 10.3.1 Metis Nation British Columbia is not referred to as Metis this sentence seems incomplete. MNBC represents more than 15,000 citizens." Thank you for identifying this mistake and providing additional information. The wording will be revised in an errata document that will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>The comment also identifies "Table 10-2; Nicola Valley ; District Metis Society is in Merritt. Kelowna Metis Association is in Kelowna. Columbia Valley Metis Association is in Invermere. Elk Valley Metis Association is in Fernie. Rocky Mountain Metis Association is in Cranbrook. North East Metis Association is in Dawson Creek. Moccasin Flat's Metis Society is located in Chetwynd." . Thank you for providing this information. Appendix S.2, Table 10-2 will be corrected in an errata document that will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>The comment also identifies "Aboriginal Consultation Report #2 11.1 Metis Nation British Columbia (the legal name has no "of"). MNBC would prefer to be referenced consistently as Metis Nation British Columbia or MNBC and not as the BC Metis Association for clarity's sake." Thank you for providing this information. The application will be corrected so that Metis Nation British Columbia/MNBC are used consistently throughout. These changes will be corrected in an errata document that will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>Regarding the assessment of effects on marbled murrelet: Section 4.7.5.2 provides a detailed review of the potential residual effects of change in habitat to marbled murrelet nesting habitat. As per Table 4.7-12, 77 ha of preferred habitat (or 3% of the LAA) will be removed within the PDA. The majority of removed habitat is categorized as moderate suitability, due to its proximity to marine water, as per Environment Canada (2014). Detailed habitat assessments were completed to support the Application to provide greater confidence in these conclusions. As described in Section 4.7.5.2, application of the vegetated riparian buffer will result in the retention of 16 ha (out of the 77 ha) of preferred nesting habitat, as well as 5 ha of identified critical habitat for marbled murrelet (Environment Canada 2014).</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment for wildlife resources is provided in Section 4.7.6 of the Application and considers the Project's contribution to change in habitat for marbled murrelet along with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and activities. The Project's contribution to change in the habitat supply target for the Northern Mainland Coast population is less than 0.0001% and is within the target supply limits identified in Environment Canada (2014). The Marbled Murrelet Management Plan is further anticipated to avoid, reduce, and mitigate change in habitat and change in mortality risk to support federal recovery objectives for this species. Aurora LNG will consult with the appropriate regulatory agencies during the development of the Marbled Murrelet Management Plan. The Project's contribution to cumulative effects of change in nesting habitat will not affect the ability to achieve short and long-term population and habitat objectives.</p> <p>References; Environment Canada. 2014a. Recovery Strategy for the Marbled Murrelet (<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>) in Canada. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series. Environment Canada, Ottawa. v + 49 pp.</p>



938 (2 of 2)	2017-03-02	Metis Nation British Columbia	<b>(cont'd from above)</b>  With all developments, some fairly permanent footprint will persist. This loss of habitat can have varied impacts depending largely on the proportion of available habitat this lost. A simple ratio of the amount of each habitat type likely to be lost from the amount available within the RAA as a direct result of the proposed project, would help clarify the scope of impact to some species. The information for much of this is mapped in the AEAC, but no raw values could be clearly determined. Clarifying this information may be important for clearly understanding the direct and cumulative impacts of the proposed project on a species-specific basis. The western toad ( <i>Anaxyrus boreas</i> ) and the Marbled Murrelet are two species where impacts could be better scoped if this information is more clearly presented. With the except of a clearly presented scope of impact on some targeted species, this AEAC meets industry standards in most areas. MNBC will work cooperatively to ensure that it's Citizen's Aboriginal rights are respected and appropriately addressed. MNBC will work diligently and in good faith to protect all the natural resources that Metis people have and continue to rely on as a way of life and cultural connection. MNBC's vision is to build a proud, self-governing, sustainable Nation in recognition of the inherent Rights of our Metis Citizens. Kind regards, Christopher Gall, B.A., M.A., J.D.	
939	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld, Vancouver, British Columbia	I cannot for the life of me, figure how this project even got off the drawing board with the reality of this Government issued report from the early 70s <a href="http://Inginnorthernbc.ca/images/uploads/documents/A%20biological%20Assessment%20of%20Fish%20Utilization%20of%20the%20Skeena%20River%20Estuary.pdf">http://Inginnorthernbc.ca/images/uploads/documents/A%20biological%20Assessment%20of%20Fish%20Utilization%20of%20the%20Skeena%20River%20Estuary.pdf</a>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
940	2017-03-02	Ron Rankin - Port Coquitlam, British Columbia	Should never be allowed. This company should be looking looking for a greener way. Save the planet.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
941	2017-03-02	L Halme - Vancouver Island, British Columbia	I am not in favour of this proposal. The spoilage of the pristine island and surrounding ocean is unacceptable as is the threat of a catastrophic event. Not only that but the fracking is too risky for our clean water supply and there seems to be too much LNG on the market worldwide.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
942	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Salt Spring Island, British Columbia	Please take responsibilities of the territory that you have been given the honour of stewardship. The entire world depends on the health of our environment, making the proposal of expanding the fossil fuel industry groundless. These words come from an 18yr old female student, and they Strongly suggest that you consider them; the parties that condone irresponsibilities, like what is being demonstrated by leading bodies presently, will be dismantled and frowned upon in the near future. The culture of fossil fuels is coming to an end and as a citizen with a widely shared viewpoint, the groups that support that culture will also be disrespected. Similar to how the general social opinion of the culture of slavery is presently seen. So please, consider even just my generation.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
943	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Hagensborg, British Columbia	It is time to move onto renewable energy sources, not expand LNG or fossil fuels. The oceans, the animals and our food and the people are much more important than this pipeline. Be brave. Make the moral choice for the environment.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
944	2017-03-02	Vicki Harper - Smithers, British Columbia	No community wants the LNG terminal site to be in their backyard. LNG is too risky of a proposal.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
945	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Ridiculous to even think of putting such a project at the mouth of our harbour and that close to the airport.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
946	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Absolutely irresponsible for this to be located in such close proximity to our town.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

947 (1 of 3)	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>In the U.S., in terms of safety LNG terminals/tankers need to be safe separation distances "to protect the public, states' concerns include provision of adequate fire and medical emergency services (such as burn centres), whether in rural or populated areas.</p> <p>I am concerned that the safe separation distance and also provision of adequate fire and medical emergency services does not exist with Aurora LNG proposal.</p> <p>I am concerned that proper studies have not been done on "potential domino effects on nearby facilities". If an accident was to take place at the Aurora LNG location, domino effects studied would have to include, all 4 trains, all 3 tankers, Ridley Coal and Grain terminals, PNW LNG terminal and tankers, and any other possibilities such as any Freighters with fuel travelling past (or cruise ships/ferries etc). Only then would we see the true potential effects on a worst-case scenario, and how that would effect Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert, also surrounding communities such as Port Edward. And the same would be if an accident was to occur at one of these other facilities, how would that create a domino effect to include Aurora LNG berths and trains.</p> <p>Potential accidents that need to be included in study would also be the crash of aircraft into a storage tank. This is usually attributed to terrorist action, which does need to be a concern, but especially on Digby Island with the proposed Aurora LNG terminal at the foot of an airport that has several flights a day, and then drastic proposed increase in air traffic to transport workers to the island, this would increase the risk substantially! Any accident of this kind would effect Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert. I am concerned that this has not been fully studied, and again worst case scenario needs to be looked at. Even if it is not likely to happen, the outcome would be enormous.</p> <p>"There is no reason to believe that introduction of "measures of risk" without supportable quantification may contribute to the contentiousness surrounding the determination of safe separation distances" "The QRA model identified uncertainties in determining appropriate dispersion separation distances, recognizing that NO LARGE-SCALE VALIDATION TEST RESULTS WERE AVAILABLE." studies based on Sandia report SAND 2004-6258 suggests that overpressures will arise only when a cloud is confined and obstacles to a propagating flame are present, for explosion effects associated with delayed ignition (vapor cloud explosion), yet the explosion of a cloud of light hydrocarbons such as butane in December 2005 at the Buncefield, U.K., tank farm - IN AN OPEN SPACE!</p> <p>I have concerns that proper tests on LNG are unavailable, and lack of knowledge of the ACTUAL actions of this gas in relation to REAL situations is unavailable, and that these TESTS NEED TO BE DONE before putting an LNG terminal so close to people. Is the LNG industry scared to have these tests performed, since the results would not work in their favour?</p> <p>Buncefield - in which a few thousand people had to evacuate and smoke was in a 10 MILE RADIUS, it was pure luck that close businesses were shut for the night or everyone would have died in the the BIGGEST PEACE TIME EXPLOSION in the UK, and originally the siting was further from residential areas but later pressure included encroaching proximity.</p> <p>If there was an accident, where there was a fire and "explosion", if the initial leak, fire, and blast did not effect residents of Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert, how would the smoke? Wind predominantly blowing in our direction most of the year, the smoke would fill our communities quickly and settle in Prince Rupert Harbour, and how would this effect evacuation routes/plans. Most smoke stays low-lying in the harbour, because of rain. How would this effect everyones health in evacuating, breathing in this smoke while trying to leave? Our health would be severely compromised by any release of smoke and the after-effects could compromise our livelihood as well.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
947 (2 of 3)	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>I am concerned that Canada does not have any Federal regulations regarding the siting of LNG facilities, but seem to be looking at each case on its own, instead of putting in standard regulatory framework as a base guideline first, and then looking at each case on top of that. I am concerned that in this case, the Provincial government is assessing this potential LNG terminal instead of the Federal government, and yet if there was an "accident" it would directly affect other Federally regulated sites such as Ridley terminals and the Container Port.</p> <p>The U.S. has a regulation that says "safe separation distances between the facility and the public sufficient to keep the latter out of harms way", based on a "pool fire" ignition, or a "vapour cloud fire" this is why they made two types of hazard zones, FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC IS FORBIDDEN, or "exclusion zones". The vapour cloud exclusion zone, the maximum distance for a spill and resulting gas evaporation and forming a cloud that drifts downwind until it ignites, includes OUR COMMUNITY and also the Container Port, Prince Rupert Waterfront, and Prince Rupert.</p> <p>A vapour cloud could definitely find an ignition source within our community, as any spark (even of static electricity!) could set it off, and definitely also could happen from the container port. I am concerned that this would happen.</p> <p>These studies were based on a spill of an operating line that could be shut off in 10 minutes or less. There is NO guarantee that a spill would be 1) from an operating line and 2) shut off in 10 min or less.</p> <p>I am concerned that the actual vapour cloud could be much larger. In 2000, in the US they changed it to the "single accidental leakage source" but also only looked at primarily pipe ruptures whether larger or small diameter. What about other ruptures??? not just pipes can fail - so if the vapour cloud and resulting exclusion zones could actually be much larger, I am concerned that this has not been assessed/studied, and indiscrepancies of the "design spill" model don't apply to actual REAL possibilities. The assessment methodology of LNG was further criticized that for "the scientific basis, especially for pool spreading, is quite unphysical." And "the cloud formed in a dike should not disperse or dilute at all until the pure vapour has accumulated in the dike to the level of top of the wall is unphysical and is likely to lead to very optimistic (non-conservative) hazard predictions." I am concerned that it is flawed scientific studies such as these that are the basis for LNG terminal hazard predictions, and I am concerned that these flawed studies are leading CNOOC-Nexen to believe that Digby Island will be suitable for placing an LNG terminal, even though Dodge Cove is much to close.</p> <p>I am concerned about all the discrepancies pointed out on fire radiation exclusion zones, are studies such as these that are shown by top industry scientists to be flawed, are also the basis of CNOOC-Nexen fire safety. Are fire studies done based on the liquid level in each storage tank - that could be 35 m? Are the studies done for a fire with the full containment tank diameter of approx 85 m? Are fire studies done with tank fires at all, or only with spills and ignition on ground? Are fire exclusion zones based on these studies about tank fires, or on ignition on ground?</p> <p>Such a tank fire, if burning on top, and suffering a roof collapse, COULD NOT BE EXTINGUISHED and would have to BURN ITSELF OUT, a process that could require TENS OF HOURS. How would this effect surrounding communities, evacuation plans, etc. What kind of manpower would be required in case of such a situation, and would that manpower be available. And what if such a fire created a domino effect with the other tanks?</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

947 (3 of 3)	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Is there any data on pool fires larger than 20m diameter on water and 35m diameter on land? Much larger fires are considered possible from LNG ship releases. "Important uncertainty exists in the accurate quantification of the fluxes that would be experienced from the surface of such large fires". Does CNOOC-Nexen base all fire info on small controlled fires that have been tested, which allows for much lower safety zones? How would a larger fire change emergency services, and affect surrounding communities?</p> <p>Sandia's analyses indicate a fire following rapid release of 1/2 of one "typical" MOSS tank (MOSS ships carry LNG in 4 or more alum spheres) through a 5 sq.m hole onto water could expose people to 2nd degree burns approx 1 mile from the center of the fire, and vapour dispersion distances for a spill that size but not ignited are 2-3 miles. Dodge Cove is only 250-500 m close at the closest point of the project, and approx 2 miles from the furthest distance of the project, so these numbers are very concerning. As well, this does not take into potential for cascading events, what if more than 1/2 a tank was released, what if a vapour cloud ignited and burned back to further damage the ship, what if the storage tanks were also compromised. The LNG industry seems to have done very limited studies on the actual effects that these scenarios would have. Ship size has increased, and increases in distances were by approx 10%, which means Dodge Cove could be engulfed by a vapour cloud of a release of LNG of 1/2 of a tank or more. LNG ships can have brittle fracture of structural steel due to contact with LNG and also insulation failure due to fire exposure, as the foam melts, causing cascading effects in the case of an accident, which could easily result in much larger accidents than ones studied by Sandia laboratories. Sandia seems to be the only laboratory to have performed any studies on LNG, and yet the scenarios studied are very limited.</p> <p>Dodge Cove residents being overlapped by this giant industrial terminal that plans to store and ship immense quantities of fuel that has the potential to kill us, are supposed to believe ON TRUST ALONE that CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG will be able to GUESS at the outcome of all these other potential accidents that could occur and prevent them from happening. Locations are not supposed to be close to communities, so that if an LNG spill does happen, we will be safe.</p>	
948	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>In the original AIR that was being studied by the working group, and on all the maps at the Public open houses, and maps distributed by CNOOC-Nexen in pamphlets and brochures, and online, Dodge Cove and Dodge Cove's OCP were not accurately shown.</p> <p>This is a form of falsifying information, when maps are being distributed and the one community that will be the MOST IMPACTED by the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project is not being shown. It skews the information to look like no community is very close to the proposed project, and on just looking at the maps, a person would quickly assume that Prince Rupert would be the closest community, followed by Metlakatla.</p> <p>Since this was also often the case at "public consultation" open houses, if the information shown to the public DOES NOT include Dodge Cove, then how would the public understand the project and comment on any concerns related to proximity to an existing community, and health concerns?</p> <p>The majority of the maps shown at open houses DID NOT show Dodge Cove on Digby Island.</p> <p>Therefore no TRUE public consultation through open houses has happened.</p> <p>Some of the maps in the Final Application have been modified to include Dodge Cove, but many still do not show Dodge Cove. Also even if Dodge Cove has been added, most do not show the Dodge Cove OCP and the overlap that the project would have into the Dodge Cove watershed.</p> <p>With this in mind, the working group and anyone else studying the AIR, and original application previous to the final application, and all the people looking at maps at public open houses, would have been given falsified information.</p> <p>How is this informing the public and consulting with the public/and working group members?</p> <p>It is ridiculous to wipe an over 100 year old community off the maps to present to the public a pretty picture of where Aurora LNG wants to build.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including for the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>The draft AIR, that was submitted to BC EAO and shared with Working Group members and the public for comment, was appropriately adjusted to indicate the location of Dodge Cove on Digby Island following feedback from this review process. There are over 150 figures in the Application and AIR combined, each of which presents geospatial information specific to the subject matter under study. Not every figure is relevant to the community of Dodge Cove nor warrants inclusion of OCP spatial boundaries.</p> <p>Figures provided in the Application and AIR were used to develop display boards, pamphlets and brochures for use at open houses. As indicated above, not every figure includes the Dodge Cove OCP boundaries and therefore not every display board, pamphlet or brochure used at open houses would have illustrated the location of Dodge Cove or OCP boundaries. For example, as is the case with surrounding communities (e.g., the City of Prince Rupert and District of Port Edward), Official Community Plan (OCP) boundaries are not illustrated on figures provided in Sections 5.2 (Economic Conditions), 6.2 (Visual Quality), 6.3 (Infrastructure and Services), 6.5 (Marine Use and Navigable Waters) and 6.6 (Community Health).</p> <p>However, figures presented in Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use), which specifically deals with overlapping land use interests (e.g., areas of Digby Island delineated by the community of Dodge Cove's OCP), would have clearly shown the community of Dodge Cove (including the location of private property), OCP boundaries, map reserves, notations of interest (of which the Dodge Cove watershed is delineated), and recreational areas (among other land use considerations).</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the location of Dodge Cove relative to the Project and the potential for the community to be affected. Where applicable, residual effect characterizations provided in Section 6 are disaggregated for the community of Dodge Cove (as well as Crippen Cove). Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application and relevant to the community of Dodge Cove is provided in Section 13.5. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living.</p>
949	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Shawnigan Lake, British Columbia	<p>I say NO to LNG anywhere period. The communities and environments affected can't be expected to accept 100% of the risk so that the LNG corporations can make a quick and very profitable, low risk buck! It's time to think of sustainable energy models like, wind, solar, geothermal and keep fossil fuels in the ground!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
950	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Squamish, British Columbia	<p>Stop expansion of oil and gas. Support expansion of renewables. Our natural BC environment is the most precious thing we have.</p> <p>Stop destroying it NOW.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
951	2017-03-02	Kevin Blackman - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Fantastic project with minimal impact if any to residents in the region. We need this project to help the area develop and become self reliant with a clean energy project.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>
952	2017-03-02	Personal Information Withheld - Alberta	<p>No to Aurora. It is dangerous to the local environment and population and life on Earth in general.</p> <p>We are tired of seeing wreckless unnecessary industrial development.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
953	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Smithers, British Columbia	<p>PLEASE DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH THIS LNG PROJECT!! IT WOULD JEPORDIZE SOO MUCH. PLEASE LISTEN -STOP- THINK- DON'T DO THIS!!!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

954	2017-03-03	Shane Deinstadt - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I fully support the development of a facility on Digby Island. This location is ideal for development as it is located some distance away from Prince Rupert, would have little or no impact on the Prince Rupert Airport and future expansion Canada is blessed with tremendous natural resources which need to be sent to market in order for Canadians to continue to enjoy the standard of living we have all become accustomed too.	Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.
955	2017-03-03	William McDuff - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	The proposed development is only a kilometer and a half of a community that was formed specifically because it was further away from the development of Prince Rupert. There are better locations for this project.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
956	2017-03-03	Max Kurz - Terrace, British Columbia	I think the Aurora LNG location on Digby Island is way too close to the population and should be permanently shelved.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
957	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	Given that the ____ standard for distance a facility should be located from a community is 3.5km, how can the project go forward when the nearest community is closer than this distance? Such a facility should not be put in place at closer than the recommended distance, particularly given recent precedent of major natural gas leaks in frozen winter waters that have not been able to be contained or halted. Lacking any regulations to ensure the safety of a community in the case of a gas leak even at further than the recommended distance, the project appears too risky to be advanced. Given the high number of vulnerable and threatened species that make their home on the project site, I believe before going forward the project should be able to provide evidence from environmental studies that there is no risk to those species (or to the nearby community). I am unaware of any such research that can be used to defend the position that these species would not be put at risk. In my own life, I am familiar with a yearly ethics review process to prove that a given research project does not put vulnerable populations at risk. The infinitely larger scope of this operation suggests that it should be subject to equal if not greater scrutiny, to proactively demonstrate that no harm will come to those communities and species in the immediate impact zone of the facility. Without such scrutiny, the project is an obvious threat to the safety of both human lives and vulnerable species. The onus is on the project developers to show a higher standard of evidence that the reduced distance from the threatened community and species will not result in irreparable harm. I suggest that the project not move forward until such evidence can be provided.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
958	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I am extremely concerned about an LNG plant being so close to the city of Prince Rupert. Regulations state that a plant can be no closer than 3.5 kms from a populated area, and Prince Rupert is 3 kms from the proposed site. The air quality will be severely impacted by a plant this close to the city. I have concerns about LNG tanker traffic in an area with severe weather such as we have. The people of Dodge Cove, which is directly beside the proposed site, will lose everything. They will no longer be able to live in their homes. We are in Canada! This sort of thing should not happen in a country like Canada! My concerns for the my health and the health of my family would most likely necessitate a move away if this plant were to happen. This is the wrong site for an LNG plant. Please, please find a different site farther away from populated areas!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. A comprehensive air quality assessment has been completed to evaluate potential effects on air quality. To protect human health and the environment, government agencies have established air quality objectives which are non-legally binding limits on the acceptable amount of contaminants in the atmosphere. Predicted air emissions in residential areas as a result of this project did not exceed applicable air quality objectives. To help companies choose potential locations for a LNG port facility and manage potential risks, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), of which the project partners are members, published a list of "general considerations" in 1997. According to SIGTTO, these considerations were meant as "basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects" (SIGTTO Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, 1997). Aurora LNG used the SIGTTO recommendations when choosing Digby Island as the site of our proposed facility. Aurora LNG also followed separate guidelines established by the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC). In choosing Digby Island as the proposed Aurora LNG site, location-specific risks were identified, these risks will undergo further assessment to determine appropriate mitigation measures as part of the engineering design phase. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of preventative measures to further reduce the potential for incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.
959	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Gabriola Island, British Columbia	A plant should be built no closer than 3.5 kms from a populated area. Dodge Cove is obviously right beside the plant and the people there will lose everything. They are not the only ones who will be affected. The City of Prince Rupert is within a 3 km radius!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

960	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Port Edward, British Columbia	<p>I am concerned about the proximity to the local population and the surrounding wildlife. Our local lands need protecting for future generations.. I understand the need for the industry as we are not ready to to use renewable resources solely yet. But what is plan to get us off the resources? How will LNG help with that? How will LNG help the local wildlife and population?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigation measures to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>As part of operating in the local community, we aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful, and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities, and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Aurora LNG has committed to 23 individual mitigation measures to avoid or reduce residual effects from the Project on terrestrial wildlife, and their ecological, cultural, and spiritual importance to each of these groups. Please refer to Section 4.7.5 of the Application for a full list of the proposed actions that Aurora LNG will undertake to support the viability of regional wildlife populations. Examples of measures that will help local wildlife include:</p> <p>1)A Wetland Compensation Plan – the Plan will be implemented to meet the requirements of no net loss of wetland functions for those wetlands defined as ecologically important by Environment and Climate Change Canada. Wildlife will benefit from creation or conservation of wetlands in order to offset the functions associated with ecologically important wetlands lost as a result of the Project.</p> <p>2)A Marbled Murrelet Management Plan will be developed and implemented to accord Project construction with federal and provincial recovery objectives and will apply mechanisms to avoid or reduce loss or alteration of preferred breeding habitat for marbled murrelet, and will outline restricted activity periods to protect murrelets from injury or mortality.</p> <p>3)A Bat Management Plan will be developed and implemented to accord Project construction with federal recovery objectives and will outline mechanisms to avoid or reduce loss or alteration of preferred breeding habitat for little brown myotis, and will outline restricted activity periods to protect bats from injury or mortality.</p>
961 (1 of 2)	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Section 9 Accidents or Malfunction The Final Comprehensive Study Report for Goldboro LNG in Nova Scotia, Canada, from October 2007, was a lot more up front about many of the impacts that any accidents or malfunctions could have.</p> <p>When assessing spills, "LNG could have possible freezing effects", yet Aurora LNG does not address LNG freezing effects and impact to local vegetation, wildlife, humans if an onshore spill was to happen. Goldboro included sections about effects on SPECIES AT RISK, and how any accidents or malfunctions would affect those species, as well as assessing impact to wildlife/habitat, marine mammals, and fish/fish habitat. I fail to see that anywhere in section 9 for Aurora LNG. (I am also going to point out that the closest species at risk was approximately 10 km away from the proposed facility - where Aurora LNG will actually be built right on top of many species of risk, killing many species that have been highlighted by both the Federal government and Provincial government to need protection).</p> <p>Aurora assuming that spills could be easily cleaned up, and not have a drastic impact to the marine environment, is laughable. Depending on the type of material, and our drastically changing weather conditions, extreme tides and storms, any cleanup may be next to impossible. Judging a large scale spill as only having a "moderate" residual effect impact seems also laughable.</p> <p>"Federal Transportation Minister Marc Garneau says the sinking of the tugboat Nathan E. Stewart shows that oil spill response resources on Canada's West Coast are inadequate. "<a href="http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/tug-sinking-shows-oil-spill-response-resources-inadequate-transport-minister/article32694781/">http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/tug-sinking-shows-oil-spill-response-resources-inadequate-transport-minister/article32694781/</a></p> <p>Has impacts such as avoidance of the habitat and disruption of feeding and migration patterns of marine mammals/fish/birds/wildlife been studied and assessed? Goldboro is clear that an LNG spill could result in asphyxiation (oxygen deficiency) of marine mammals - nowhere do I see that clearly outlined in Aurora LNG's report. Again, Goldboro "wildlife that may come into direct contact with LNG may be affected by freezing effects" and "an LNG release to the marine environment could result in direct bird mortality. As LNG is a cryogenic liquid at -161 degrees celsius, the extreme low temperature could result in severe freezing on contact if birds remained on the water" in that area. It goes on to describe more, similar descriptions that are direct about the immediate potential effects, and residual effects, I fail to see in the Aurora LNG application. Again, it talks about freezing people on contact, or asphyxiation, I do not see this in the Aurora LNG application.</p> <p>Aurora claims that a spill may temporarily delay marine traffic but is expected to be reversible within one month or less. Marine traffic in and out of Prince Rupert harbour, how much disruption, inconvenience, and taxpayer dollars would such an event cost the local and provincial residents? How many existing businesses in Prince Rupert would be disrupted by this, and what impact to existing economy? I do not see any estimates.</p> <p>Why does Aurora LNG say that worker health is beyond the scope of the assessment? That seems strange. Impacts of accidents on workers should be assessed as well.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigation measures to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>Potential effects of on-shore LNG spills are assessed in Section 9.8 of the Application. The worst case scenario considers loss of on-shore LNG secondary containment in storage tanks in the context of preventative and response measures. Potential effects of freezing on local vegetation, wildlife and people were not discussed as a spill of LNG is expected to be restricted to the PDA and as such, is unlikely to affect vegetation, wildlife or people beyond Project boundaries. Because an LNG spill is not anticipated to spread beyond the PDA boundary, effects to vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat (including species at risk) are not anticipated beyond what has been described for Project construction and operation in Sections 4.6 and 4.7 of the Application.</p> <p>Potential effects of off-shore LNG spills are assessed in Sections 9.9 and 9.10 of the Application. The worst case scenario considers a hull breach and containment failure of an LNG membrane tank with up to 48,000 m3 of LNG released into the marine environment. Potential effects are assessed for all Valued Components including marine fish and fish habitat, marine mammals, and marine birds. Many marine bird species are present within the RAA year-round and are tolerant to a certain degree of plasticity in air and water temperature, including occasional ice build up in sheltered bays, estuaries, and on coastal infrastructure. Because birds are highly mobile, it is anticipated that they will rapidly disperse from an LNG spill location if conditions (i.e., air or water temperature) drops below a tolerable level. Because birds are also generally distributed across the RAA in low densities (with the exception of seasonal foraging or dispersal events), a worst-case scenario of immediate freezing is anticipated to result in the mortality of a low number of individual birds.</p> <p>Should LNG spill into the marine environment, water and other surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the spill will freeze. Upon cessation of the spill, the ice created by the spill will warm and melt rapidly back to ambient conditions, with LNG vaporizing and dispersing into the atmosphere. Since LNG evaporates quickly and does not leave a residue, a spill clean-up is not anticipated. If water freezes and results in environmental damage, appropriate restoration programs will be deployed. As such this type of spill is expected to cause limited delay to local marine traffic and be reversible within one month or less.</p> <p>Potential effects of an off-shore marine fuel spill are considered in Section 9.9 of the Application. The worst case scenario considers a hull breach and containment failure of one marine fuel tank up to 2,500 m3 in volume. Response measures and restoration programs specific to this type of spill will be deployed as summarized in Section 9.9.2. Potential effects on infrastructure services, marine use and navigable waters, community health and human health are discussed in Section 9.9.4.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

961 (2 of 2)	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In "facility impact from aircraft" Aurora LNG fails to identify the very real problem that airplanes have with flaring plumes, and how the change in air above flaring can make a plane fall out of the sky.</p> <p>On shore fires and explosions - Aurora constantly mentions impacts to the LAA without focusing on the fact that the community of Dodge Cove is on Digby Island, I fail to see any accurate descriptions of the impact to Dodge Cove in case of many accident and malfunction scenarios, including on shore fires and explosions. Goldboro says "local air quality conditions associated with the fire and the flames have the potential to kill humans and wildlife in the area. The major emissions would be smoke (PM) and CO2 but would also include CO, NOX, SO2, VOCs and PAHs (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons). A large fire could create PM levels greater than the ambient air quality standard over distances greater than 10 km" yet the Aurora LNG application says that people should avoid exposure to smoke and particulates by remaining indoors and closing windows (would this really help the residents of Dodge Cove assuming we were not killed already by fire/explosion?) and even Prince Rupert is only 3 km away and could be drastically affected. This assessment fails to accurately describe affects and residual effects of a fire or explosions. There seems to be no accurate reflection of health impacts that could result from exposure to smoke.</p> <p>Proof that LNG accidents happen: In 2014, the explosions at an LNG facility in Washington had much impact. The closest town 2 miles away and surrounding communities had to evacuate, workers were injured, it caused \$69 million in damages, shut down traffic on the nearby Columbia River, on the highway and damaged the railway. According to news articles it released LNG vapor clouds into nearby residential areas, and fumes from the facility sickened residents, emergency responders, and endangered the public. <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2016/06/03/williams-companies-failed-to-protect-employees-in-plymouth-lng-explosion/">http://www.sightline.org/2016/06/03/williams-companies-failed-to-protect-employees-in-plymouth-lng-explosion/</a> <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2016/02/08/how-industry-and-regulators-kept-public-in-the-dark-after-2014-lng-explosion-in-washington/">http://www.sightline.org/2016/02/08/how-industry-and-regulators-kept-public-in-the-dark-after-2014-lng-explosion-in-washington/</a></p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>If an accident or malfunction causes deleterious effects to fish or fish habitat that are considered by DFO to constitute serious harm to fish, additional habitat offsetting may be required beyond that needed to counterbalance the predicted Project effects; Aurora LNG would be committed to fulfilling this obligation. Although worker safety is beyond the scope of the Aurora LNG environmental assessment, death or serious injury to workers as a result of on-shore or off-shore spills will affect community health and well being in those communities in which the workers and their families live. Physical injury and mortality to workers during an accident or malfunction is part of WorkSafeBC and Occupational Health and Safety regulations and not within the scope of this assessment. Aurora LNG is working closely with Transport Canada and Nav Canada while developing flare stack design and location in the context of the adjacent airport to ensure Project activities do not interfere with civil aviation in the area. Potential effects of flaring on aircraft traffic are discussed in Section 9.7 of the Application. The assessment acknowledges that some flaring activities could temporarily interfere with civil aviation. The Project design currently includes mitigation measures to reduce the geographical extent and vertical velocity of gas plumes from the Project during the operations phase, which will also apply during flaring from an LNG plant malfunction scenario. Close collaborative planning will also take place with the Prince Rupert Airport Authority to identify the potentially affected airspace during these flaring events. For additional details specific to potential effects of flaring on aviation please refer to the associated technical memo ("Potential Effects on Aviation as a result of Accidents or Malfunctions") which will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>On-shore fires and explosions are assessed in Section 9.6 of the Application. Although it is unlikely that a fire would extend beyond the boundaries of the PDA, the event used for this assessment assumed an accidental ignition of any flammable substance (e.g., natural gas, engine fuel, or natural fuel sources such as vegetation or slash piles) with the potential to spread beyond the PDA but remaining on Digby Island. The assessment includes consideration of potential interactions with air quality and terrestrial wildlife (including species at risk).</p> <p>The Project design process will include a hazard and operability study to identify and evaluate risks to personnel, equipment and the environment. Emergency response plans will be developed for the Project to limit the potential effects on the environment and nearby residents as a result of accidents or malfunctions.</p>
962	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I don't feel that CNOOC-Nexen has looked at all these impacts that Aurora LNG could have on local populations such as residents of Dodge Cove, Crippen Cove, and Prince Rupert in the case of a major accident scenario. These concerns need to be looked at, and how the local populations could be majorly impacted by other health and property damage if a major accident occurred (if these populations were not completely killed by the accident).</p> <p>"Main types of major accident scenarios: Explosion - Levels of blast overpressure which may be harmful to humans and animals and damage buildings. Projectiles travelling at high speeds may also spread from the explosion presenting a risk to people, animals and damage buildings. Explosions may also initiate fires. Fire - Ranges from an intense fire lasting several seconds to large fires lasting several minutes or hours. Potential for fire damage to people and the environment and fires may spread to other areas, a drifting cloud of flammable gas may ignite. Fires may generate smoke clouds which may lead to breathing difficulties and deposition of soot on property and vegetation. Release of extremely cold liquids The potential consequences of major accident hazards Potential consequences on Human Health: Breathing air with high concentrations of gases other than oxygen can lead to asphyxiation and/or poisoning, which could result in unconsciousness Direct contact with liquefied gases has the potential to cause frostbite or cold burns and severe damage to eyes Injuries (possibly fatal) caused by flying debris etc. being ejected from the incident site. Injuries caused by fragments etc. being ejected from the incident site Injuries from being blown over by blast pressure Potential for burns to body (possibly life threatening) Risk of eardrum damage from blast Traumatic injuries are possible due to being hit by flying fragments and objects Potential consequences on the Environment: Physical damage to and contamination of unlisted buildings and offsite such as houses" These are excerpts from the public information about Dragon LNG on the Health and Safety Executives website; <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/comah-establishments.htm">http://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/comah-establishments.htm</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>When selecting the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special inquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>On-shore fires and explosions are assessed in Section 9.6 of the Application. Although it is unlikely that a fire would extend beyond the boundaries of the PDA, the event used for this assessment assumed an accidental ignition of any flammable substance (e.g., natural gas, engine fuel, or natural fuel sources such as vegetation or slash piles) with the potential to spread beyond the PDA but remaining on Digby Island. The assessment includes consideration of potential interactions with air quality and terrestrial wildlife (including species at risk).</p> <p>The Project design process will include a hazard and operability study to identify and evaluate risks to personnel, equipment and the environment. Emergency response plans will be developed for the Project to limit the potential effects on the environment and nearby residents as a result of accidents or malfunctions. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
963	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 1: Below is a compilation of concerns and effects that were sent to the Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resources when CNOOC-Nexen applied for an Investigative Use Licence to drill across Digby Island.</p> <p>There was absolutely no response from the MFLNR about these concerns before they approved the IUL licence, and I think it is valid to re-submit these concerns to the BCEAO, as many are still appropriate except on a much wider and more serious scale if the Aurora LNG project was to get approved.</p> <p>Many of the concerns that were listed here did become a fact as Nexen helicopters disturbed both wildlife and residents throughout most of the past year. We have seen direct changes in wildlife patterns, direct changes to use of the island by both residents and visitors, and consistent helicopter traffic disrupting the Dodge Cove green space and use of those areas by residents, as well as constantly irritating residents in their homes with windows closed, as well as outside, including right overtop the community at times, inside the Dodge Cove OCP, and right above and behind our homes.</p> <p>The stress of the ongoing activity, noise levels, and trying to engage in the EA process at the same time as trying to process what the hell we are going to do if this project gets approved, and the fact that everything we have invested in and built might be completely uninhabitable, has been a depressing and mentally anguishing process.</p> <p>The fact that everybody we love around us will be affected and are going through the same stress and concern for the future is also very heartbreaking.</p> <p>Impacts to Dodge Cove and Dodge Cove Residents Impact to food gathering and hunting lands. These drill sites are all over, and will have a direct impact to areas that are presently used for gathering many different kinds of food, and for hunting. The clearing sites will brush cut all berry bushes, and remove habitat for animals and birds, and remove plants of special concern as well as affect amphibians. The noise and traffic will disturb all the birds and animals that live and migrate here. (Pages of animals, amphibians, and birds are identified as living on Digby Island and using Digby Island as migratory habitat. Many are identified as species at risk on the lists SARA, COSEWIC, and are provincially red and blue listed.)</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

964	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Part 2: Disturbance to wildlife. Vegetation clearing can potentially destroy bird and amphibian eggs (many of which are species that are threatened or of special concern) and the offspring of mammals, birds and amphibians. Noise and construction activities that are adjacent to habitats can cause adult birds to abandon their nests, increasing mortality to eggs and young (exposure to cold and predators). Citizens of Dodge Cove have already been concerned about the impact that Nexen has already had on the species at risk, this increase in activity is unacceptable.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment so that the potential effects of the Project would not be underestimated. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential effects to terrestrial wildlife. Section 4.7.5.3 of the Application addressed the potential increase in mortality risk associated with vegetation clearing and disturbance during Project construction. Aurora LNG has committed to several mitigation measures to limit the potential for harm or destruction of mammals, birds, and amphibians (including their breeding sites and offspring). For example, Aurora LNG will schedule vegetation clearing outside of recommended restricted activity periods to reduce the risk of disturbance, injury, or mortality to breeding wildlife. The design of the Project Development Area has also been refined to include a minimum 30 m riparian buffer to retain habitat, including two bald eagle nests on the east side of Digby Island. The riparian buffer will also reduce noise and light disturbance to adjacent habitats retained on Digby Island. Aurora LNG has identified several actions to reduce potential residual effects from the Project to species at risk. A Wildlife Management Plan will be developed to outline detailed mitigation measures for wildlife, and will include protection measures for great blue heron and western toad. Additionally, separate Marbled Murrelet and Bat Management Plans will be developed to outline measures to avoid, reduce, and mitigate for potential effects to marbled murrelet and little brown myotis. Please see Section 4.7.5 for a complete list of mitigation measures.
965	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Part 3: Water use. The water use for the drilling is of concern. Where the water is being removed from is a concern. Impacts could be drastic on our watershed, salmon creeks, and other amphibians and wildlife that live on the island. Stream crossings are mentioned, this could destroy existing salmon habitat.	Aurora LNG acknowledges and appreciates your concerns. Aurora LNG will ensure that best management practices, mitigation measures and any other related regulatory requirements are adhered to with respect to water use and interactions with the watersheds and aquatic habitats. It should also be noted that the Project will not withdraw freshwater for use in the facility.
966	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Part 4: Base Line Studies. Base line studies for the entire project (needed by the EAO to assess the impacts that this would have) must be done before the increased helicopter traffic and human traffic on this island. Have base line studies already been done? And how were they completed - as there already has been a direct impact to the island and Dodge Cove residents in the last year from Nexen-CNOOC investigative work. It's not a base line if helicopters and people have already changed existing impact levels. "Nexen does not anticipate any socio-community impacts resulting from the activities". Dodge Cove is not even listed in the IUL application. Besides the many full-time residents who live here, there are also many part-time residents who it will also affect. Mental health, stress, and overall community health are serious concerns. Nexen says "The helicopters, drilling rigs and clearcutting "brush clearing" will result in noise, dust, and emissions." These impacts will be significant to the residents of Dodge Cove and to tourists.	Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potential adverse effects of the Project, including those potentially affecting Dodge Cove residents, and to determine ways to avoid or lessen the potential adverse effects. Baseline studies to support the assessment of adverse effects on environment, economic, social, health and heritage as provided in the Application were completed in accordance with requirements set out in the approved Application Information Requirements. Helicopter activity is related to Aurora LNG's intensive use license (IUL) issued by BC FLNRO. These baseline studies were not a requirement of the IUL. Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful, and mutually beneficial relationships with local communities, including the residents of Dodge Cove.
967	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Part 5: Proximity to Dodge Cove. This is of major concern, as drill sites surround us and come within 0.5 km of our homes, so the traffic and impacts to our stress and health are very real concerns. The actual footprint of the Investigative Use Licence crosses over into our community green space, and we have already been dealing with the effects of that. At least once a helicopter has landed in our green space, to pick up employees that were in our green space, and disturbing residents of Dodge Cove. Drilling in the watershed and how that will affect our water supply. What bond does the company put against that in case it does affect the water supply. How will the dust and emissions from drilling affect our water quality? How will it affect existing water routes?	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our emissions and overall environmental footprint. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
968	2017-03-03	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	Part 6: Visual Quality. Hundreds of tourists each year use the hiking trails on this island, as well as the local residents. These drill sites will damage the trails and create an unfriendly tourist environment. There are several areas of heritage landmarks that people hike to, and while these drill sites may be to the side of these landmarks, it will still have a direct impact on the visual quality of these places. Dodge Cove and Digby Island has hundreds of visitors every year: friends, family, tourists, hikers, kayakers, campers, whale watchers, sportfishermen, commercial fishermen, sailboats that live here for months on end. Dodge Cove has annual events that the wider community enjoy. Previous residents of Dodge Cove still come back for reunions and other events, such as weddings. Dodge Cove has had sportfishing lodges for the last decade, and those tourists enjoy the rest of the island (hiking) as well. Dodge Cove has houses rented out periodically to visitors who come here to enjoy the island, and the wildlife. Many of these concerns impact present land use by the community and for tourism, as well as future land use. Marketable timber is larger trees, while "unmarketable" timber like the muskeg pines may be small and twisted, but often are 300 plus years old. Nexen has applied for 2500 cubic metres of timber (just marketable?) and if the average size tree is 2' across and 45' tall, then that would be 833 trees approximately. Or 533 average large trees, and 1000 muskeg pine trees. The residents of Dodge Cove have purposefully kept a low impact on Digby Island, this amount of trees to be clearcut and discarded is unacceptable. Mature and old forest that is removed can take more than 600 years to go back to pre-impacted conditions.	Potential effects on outdoor recreation are addressed in Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use). Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project will affect access and result in a loss of some recreational activities on the south end of Digby Island. Potential effects on the quality of life of Dodge Cove residents is addressed in Section 13.5.1. Aurora LNG believes that the implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 13.1.5.4, as well as those described in Sections 4.2 (air quality) , 4.4 (acoustic environment) , 4.5 (water quality) , and 6.2 (visual quality) will help reduce potential adverse effects on the quality of life of Dodge Cove and other area residents. However, given the relatively small size of the community and its proximity to the PDA, changes to the perceived quality of life and community identity for Dodge Cove residents (access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is still anticipated. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. Construction will result in the loss of up to 75 ha of old-growth forest in the Project Development Area (see Figure 4.6 -3; Table 3-6 in Appendix I, Vegetation and Wetland Resources Technical Data Report), which corresponds to less than 1% of the extent of old forest within the Regional Assessment Area. The Great Bear Rainforest Order allows for removal of up to 40% of old forest in specified landscape units or 70% overall, so, the percent of old forest to be removed from the regional assessment area by the Project is far below these allowable limits under established land use directives.

969	2017-03-04	doug krause, winnipeg	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. This carbon bomb must be stopped. Stand up for the Skeena wild salmon and the northern economy. They need your support. STOP this from being developed. Please. Sincerely, doug krause, winnipeg cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
970	2017-03-04	Ellen Koivisto, San Francisco	Dear EAO, Fracked gas plants do not make good neighbors. They are toxic to wildlife, toxic to plants, toxic to people. No on the Aurora LNG near Prince Rupert on Digby Island. Save life. Sincerely, Ellen Koivisto, San Francisco cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
971	2017-03-04	isaqbelle boiscgard, st-raymond	Dear EAO, Sincerely, isaqbelle boiscgard, st-raymond cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman Dear EAO, Sincerely, cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
972	2017-03-04	Terrie Williams, Vidor	Dear EAO, <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b> The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas. Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b> The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of Dodge Cove residents were opposed to the project. The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. <b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b> As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Please, stop this carbon bomb and save our salmon. Sincerely, Terrie Williams, Vidor cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.
973	2017-03-04	Lee Fister, Allentown	Dear EAO, Save all of nature in the name of Jesus!! don't kill but let live!! Sincerely, Lee Fister, Allentown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
974	2017-03-04	Ray James Bradbury, WEST VANCOUVER	Dear EAO, Please reject this horrendous and damaging Aurora LNG which proposal only harms British Columbia and its people. Leave this gas in the ground. Sincerely, Ray James Bradbury, WEST VANCOUVER cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
975	2017-03-04	Claude Robert, Shefford	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Claude Robert, Shefford cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.



976	2017-03-04	Jane Davidson, Englewood	Dear EAO, Please stop dangerous industry from destroying our precious nature and wildlife. We must act against climate change and preserve what wilderness remains. This is our only hope for a good quality of life for ourselves and our children of the future.. Thank you. Sincerely, Jane Davidson, Englewood cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
977	2017-03-04	Kenneth Schadt, Vancouver	Dear EAO, Aurora LNG is a massive fracked gas plant being proposed by Nexen, which is owned by Chinese oil giant CNOOC. It would be built near Prince Rupert on Digby Island, just north of the Skeena estuary where up to a billion young salmon make their way to the ocean each year. The nearby community of Dodge Cove is at risk of becoming surrounded by a dangerous industrial zone. ... this carbon bomb must be stopped. Sincerely, Kenneth Schadt, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
978	2017-03-04	Rosemary Partridge, Saltspring Island	Dear EAO, We must stop behaving as though we are the only life forms on the planet!, Surely one of the most beautiful places and habitats on the planet is worth preserving. Sincerely, Rosemary Partridge, Saltspring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
979	2017-03-04	J Churcher, Vancouver	Dear EAO, Please say no to Aurora LNG. In addition to aggravating the serious global climate crisis with which we are faced, this project will further imperil steelhead, coho, and sockeye salmon (already under threat), birds and wildlife at all levels of the ecosystem that depend on the nearby ancient muskeg estuary, and subject nearby residents, who cherish the natural world they've chosen to live within to all manner of pollution. I am also extremely concerned about the risks involved with tankers navigating the narrow channel of Prince Rupert which is subject to strong tidal currents and severe storms (increasingly severe due to global warming). In addition, the project flies in the face of indigenous priorities and wishes. When will this government recognize the rights of our first nations and cease from raping them of their rights and natural heritage? My comments are cursory. I trust you are well aware of the details of all of the points I have raised and will respond to the growing tide of people around the world the value the health of our ecosystems ahead of fossil fuel development and the interests of business. Sincerely, J Churcher, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
980	2017-03-04	Ben Murray, Edmonton	Dear EAO, NO to the Aurora LNG!! This ill-considered project will jeopardize the health of Skeena Estuary's salmon population, not to mention the community of nearby Dodge Cove. Do the right thing, and kill this project before it gets off the ground Sincerely, Ben Murray, Edmonton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
981	2017-03-04	marc schoenberg, farmington hills	Dear EAO, Sincerely, marc schoenberg, farmington hills cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
982	2017-03-04	Agnes Watts, Vancouver	Dear EAO, We can't have it both ways. We can't say we believe in saving the environment and meeting our Paris Accord commitments while simultaneously allowing a Chinese fossil fuel company to rape our environment and create vast amounts of carbon pollution, to feed their monstrous industrial requirements. LNG is no better than dirty coal, when all aspects of development and production are factored in. In this case the damage to the pristine environment of the north would be permanently devastating. China already has huge wastelands, thanks to industrialization. We must not let them do the same thing to our country. This plant is a terrible idea. It will create short-term wealth for a tiny amount of people, in exchange for the destruction of some of our most precious natural environment. That's no bargain and we must say no. Sincerely, Agnes Watts, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

983	2017-03-04	Jana Ronne, Vancouver	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I want to express my opposition to the Aurora LNG plant.</p> <p>The Digby Island area provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon and Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. The proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p>The plant would also pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. This project would also smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jana Ronne, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
984	2017-03-04	tom harris, bordertown	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, tom harris, bordertown cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
985	2017-03-04	Elaine Becker, Roanoke	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Big Oil is going the way of the dinosaurs - don't let them drag us all with them!</p> <p>Please help save species, including Humans, from the ravages of tracking.Say NO to Aurora LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely, Elaine Becker, Roanoke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
986	2017-03-04	anthony montapert, ventura	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, anthony montapert, ventura cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
987	2017-03-04	Wendelin Gott, Victoria	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am opposed whole heartedly to the building of the Aurora LNG plant in the Prince Rupert/Digby Island area. This is an area that needs protection from pollution as it is a precious wetlands area and the Skeena Salmon use it in the continuing of their species population. This is not a viable project for this area and must not be built.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendelin Gott, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
988	2017-03-04	Elizabeth Keenan, Toronto	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Sincerely, Elizabeth Keenan, Toronto cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
989	2017-03-04	Rosemary Hartley, Nipigon	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>There is no recognition as to what nature can provide us in the longer term. Destruction of natural resources to access limited non-renewable resources leads us to a path where we will have nothing.</p> <p>Plans should be in place to promote sustainable communities and how to make communities sustainable, not how to provide a profit for a few, for a short period of time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rosemary Hartley, Nipigon cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
990	2017-03-04	Charlotte Snowsell, VICTORIA	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>,It seems the Liberal Party of BC are bent on destroying everything!. The great" hard hat group" continues to forge ahead projects, without regard to the historical values, environmental, wild life and human impact .... all for those votes and money. Keep Asia happy ... our county is for sale at all costs.</p> <p>Aside from all these mentioned issues ,now, without regard for the salmon historical habitat and runs . Salmon are an irreplaceable food source for all and critical for the wildlife living on the land. Without touching anything the success is always in jeopardy. Everything depends on the balances in nature . It's a miracle to behold.</p> <p>Who are these experts, that think they can play Masters of the universe? I am so discouraged to see such utter disregard .in my life time. I worry for our grandchildren . Haven't we just gone through a lot of these concerns with the Petronas project. A disaster in the making!! So upsetting... our beautiful and bountiful Skeena River waiting to be ruined and polluted. We are still not sure of that. Tankers will be just as problematic with this fiasco. The seas are rough , storms frequent, congestion apparent right now Whose checking on double hulled carriers??Where are the cleanup crews? Never should we forget Valdez ( Maybe oil but still a disaster of unprecedented magnitude ( that we know about) Sorry will never be good enough !! Bittumin?.....LNG ? leave the river alone. Spare the wonderful neighbours of Prince Rupert and environs this dreadful conquest of their lives and homes!!</p> <p>Please do something.</p> <p>Sincerely, Charlotte Snowsell, VICTORIA cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

991	2017-03-04	rebecca koo, san diego	Dear EAO, Sincerely, rebecca koo, san diego cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
992	2017-03-04	Kimberly Lowe, Gahanna	Dear EAO, no to aurora ling. absolutely - no. Sincerely, Kimberly Lowe, Gahanna cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
993	2017-03-04	Lolree - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Disgusting display of future poisoning of our people . This is not an area to have an lng plant or any lng plant . we do not want fracking methane dredging poisoning of our water lands or air . Too close to the populated areas . way to close to prince Rupert digby island and port Edward , who in their right mind decided it was okay to put children and families at risk , who decided it is okay to destroy our salmon , the very essence of life is water . get out of BC and stay out of BC and stay way from the north coast .. Very concerned about the total destruction of a very sensitive eco system such as ours ..	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
994	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	I found a major difference between the measures used to predict community health for the local area, and what I would consider community health while living in Dodge Cove. Measures that are being used in the AIR to predict community health are the following, many that do not even apply to us at all, since Dodge Cove has none of it. CNOOC-Nexen is using the figures for the LAA (prince rupert for sure, and possibly other surrounding communities) to describe conditions across the LAA. But conditions in Dodge Cove are not the same at all. The figures for the LAA in no way measure community health in Dodge Cove. Crime - NONE Human Economic Hardship Health - (used to be great, stress is taking its toll) Education Children at Risk - NONE Youth at Risk - NONE Suicide Rates - NONE Self-Inflicted injuries- NONE HIV and other STD's - NONE Motor vehicle accidents - NONE Stress (We have lots now that the Aurora LNG export terminal is planned) Social cohesion and reduced conflict (Dodge Cove has in many ways had more conflict and less social cohesion thanks to the massive amounts of stress residents are now under) Income When I talked to another resident about what our measures of community health would be, they mentioned a very simple but accurate measure of "whether people are happy". I thought of things such as "can kids play safely on the beach at Marine Bay?" Is it safe for children to play outside on their own, walk around the community on their own, ride bikes around the community on their own? Do we know all our neighbours and stop and talk to them on the road/trail/dock, do people help each other and watch out for each other? Can we enjoy being outdoors, in our yard or on trails, can we hear natural sounds, the animals and birds, can we interact with the animals and birds, can we harvest our traditional foods where we traditionally harvest. Do we need to have stressful meetings all the time to deal with outside pressures and influences, or can we just enjoy interacting with our neighbours in a stress-free manner including social and spiritual gatherings. Are long-term residents moving away? Can we sleep at night? Stress/noise levels. Do we have privacy? Quiet? Access to traditional lands/waters that we have always had? Can small businesses operate as they have always done? Will other families move here to live full-time? Will similar minded people wish to live in this community? Will people be able to purchase homes and live here in a healthy manner?	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Measurable parameters used in the assessment of change in community health and wellness (Section 6.6 of the Application) include occurrence-rates for medical and mental health incidents and change in select social determinants of health. As noted in the comment, some of the indicators used to describe baseline conditions related to these measurable parameters include crime, human economic hardship, stress and anxiety, sexually transmitted infections, motor vehicle injuries and deaths, suicide rates, and youth- and children-at-risk, among numerous others. Statistical baseline data on these indicators was taken from provincial and federal publications at the local health area and/or health service delivery area. Both administrative areas include the community of Dodge Cove. However, as noted in the comment, several of these indicators either do not directly apply to Dodge Cove. Aurora LNG recognizes that the community of Dodge Cove exhibits unique characteristics that are not necessarily shared with that of the local or regional assessment areas (LAA and RAA) and that potentially adverse effects could be disproportionately realized by residents of Dodge Cove. As such, the assessment of potential adverse residual and cumulative effects used a conservative approach that assumed adverse effects on the community of Dodge Cove would be higher in magnitude than on remaining LAA and RAA communities (where applicable). Therefore, Section 6.6 of the Application concludes that while potential Project residual adverse and cumulative adverse effects on change in community health and wellness are assessed as not significant, adverse residual effects are expected to disproportionately affect vulnerable populations and residents of Dodge Cove. Measurable parameters suggested in the comment (through a series of questions) include; safety, social cohesion (e.g., community members know one another and can ask for help), access and enjoyment of the natural environment (both recreationally and for harvesting purposes), stress, out-migration, noise, privacy, changes in commercial business, demographics, in-migration, accommodations, and health. Together, these measurable parameters, as suggested in the comment contribute to an overall measure of community health "whether people are healthy". Regarding these measurable parameters, all are included in either Section 6.6 (directly or indirectly through reference to other sections of the Application) or other supporting sections of the Application (e.g., Section 4.2 through 6.5 or Section 13.5). As such, additional consideration of these measurable parameters/indicators is not required.

995	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I have yet to see the following information regarding impacts on human health due to flaring, clearly stated in the Final Application for Aurora LNG. These impacts would be of direct concern to residents in Dodge Cove, being 1/2 km away.</p> <p>Also the lack of honesty in what critical illnesses that the residents in Dodge Cove would most likely experience, being so close to flaring, that even in the start up of the LNG terminal would take several weeks of 24/7 flaring, and then at any time other major releases of flaring whenever needed, as well as when ships are in (which is each day). Where has the impact to Dodge Cove health (such as leukemia?) been mentioned. I am amazed that our Canadian government would even possibly think about letting such a major industrial operation surround a community and let such health impacts be felt by Canadian citizens. In what Canadian first world country standards is this ok?</p> <p>"3.2.2 Impacts of gas flaring Communities have reported a range of illnesses associated with the pollution, including gastrointestinal problems, skin diseases, cancers and respiratory ailments. It is difficult to ascertain how many are specifically caused by the oil and gas industry as these are generally longterm illnesses. A 2001 scientific study of the adverse health effects of gas flaring in Canada lists various cancers, respiratory disease, heart disease, rheumatic disorders and eye problems (Argo 2001). EJP/ERA (2005) warn that gas flaring in Nigeria can cause leukemia among populations living close to the flares, citing supporting evidence from the US Environmental Protection Agency. They estimate that around 35,000 people live within a 1.3 km radius and 330,000 people within a 5 km radius of a flow station. Another study carried out in southeastern Nigeria showed evidence of acid rain due to gas flaring, which can contaminate waterbodies and soils (Akpan 2003)." <a href="http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/oil-and-gas-exploration/soss-oil-and-gas-flaring.pdf">http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/oil-and-gas-exploration/soss-oil-and-gas-flaring.pdf</a> "To prepare for this support role we developed a broad understanding of the adverse impact of chronic exposure from multiple flaring discharges on the health of people who live and work in proximity to the industry. Proximity can be from 0.2 km up to 35+ km. OBJECTIVE It is our objective to convey the knowledge that the development of oil and gas comes with a terrible cost in human health. The cost is not for the workers on-site, though they are affected. It is to women and children, the aged and infirm, the teachers and doctors and pharmacists and priests and First Nations peoples who live away from but in proximity to a flare site. They live at home. They are unprotected by Labor-code statutes about exposure because they live at home and are exposed where they sleep and eat as wind carries the plume of combustion products from the source to their residence Oil companies and the oil industry repeatedly tell us that there is no harm done by their activities, either to humans or livestock. They characterise their actions as responsible and benign, harmless to residents and with risks only to workers immediately affected. We expect Industry to tell this Hearing that no adverse human health effects are known and no adverse ecological effects are expected. We will rebut their arguments and present flaring as a broad, multi-faceted disturbance of the system of human activities for as much as 30 km from any flare. We will use publicly available peer-reviewed scientific literature to present our rebuttal. Discussing flaring in terms of single issues is like a painting in greys - lifeless. For a full appreciation of its long-term impact, flaring must be considered on several levels of adverse health effects. These include chronic diseases, viz. cancer, diabetes, heart disease etc.; issues associated with the constant presence of flaring manifested as stress and AI and chemical sensitivity; issues associated with the division of communities into camps, again usually manifested as stress." <a href="http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2011/433768/EXPO-DEVE_ET(2011)433768_EN.pdf">http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2011/433768/EXPO-DEVE_ET(2011)433768_EN.pdf</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
996	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>This project needs to be moved! It will destroy our waters, it will kill entire species of wildlife, it will hinder tourism in Prince Rupert, it will increase pollution, it could cost every fisherman their livelihood. The cons list is endless. All for a probable 30 year stint. Then what? Who will be left to clean up the mess and destruction? My kids. Just has my generation has been paying for the old pulp mill, although I fear this would be at a greater magnitude. As much as the idea of job creation and money is great, its not everything. The cost is too high. Move this project east.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
997	2017-03-04	Agnes Watts - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>This is a terrible idea, from all aspects. It will do irreversible damage to the environment, both locally and globally, and irretrievable damage to salmon stocks, wild bird populations, and other wild populations in the area, all to prolong the use of fossil fuels, so that a few people in China and Canada can gain temporary wealth. Shame on them! Human greed will be our universal downfall.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
998	2017-03-04	Wendy Poole - Comox, British Columbia	<p>Growing up in Prince Rupert and area, I know how sensitive the area is. Where the LNG project is being planned for doesn't make sense geographically. The entrance to the harbour is narrow, not a place for dangerous materials to be processed and moved about.</p> <p>This is another example of the intelligence of the people being ignored for the benefit of big business.</p> <p>Why not be proactive, show leadership by looking beyond fossil fuels as energy, to sustainable energy. It's pure common sense, but doesn't fit the short term goals politicians perpetually focus on. We need to look at the greater good of ALL.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
999	2017-03-04	Wendelin Gott - Victoria, British Columbia	<p>Hello, I am opposed to the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project. This area is a sensitive wetlands and would affect the Skeena Salmon breeding, which would be a catastrophe for the fishing in the area. This is an inappropriate area for an LNG plant, as the future of the area needs to be considered environmentally, for tourism and fishing.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1000	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Penticton, British Columbia	<p>NO! NO! NO! TO LNG. The risk to the environment is just too great. If the plan is to build within the specified limit now - how can anyone believe in the event of a spill that corrective clean-up will happen?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1001	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I support the Aurora LNG project. Recently, they held a community information session in Prince Rupert where I learned that most of the development will be 3-4km from Dodge Cove. I initially had concerns that the facility may be too close to the community for their comfort but this put my mind at ease. Also, there have been concerns expressed over its proximity to the airport. We really just have to look at the major airports around the world and their proximity to urban areas to understand that this isn't an issue.</p> <p>From an environmental standpoint, I don't buy into the fear tactics that many are spreading. LNG development stands to help decrease global pollution, and this project most certainly won't harm the salmon. Many would like you to believe otherwise.</p> <p>Welcome to Prince Rupert! Looking forward to seeing ground break.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>

1002	2017-03-04	Personal Information Withheld - Shawnigan Lake, British Columbia	No do NOT allow this to go forward. No & No again and again. It is wrong and the industry is already dead before it begins.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1003	2017-03-05	Karen Smith, Vancouver	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Karen Smith, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
1004	2017-03-05	Craig Murray, Windsor	Dear EAO, As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget. Please don't allow this antiquated fossil fuel plant. Sincerely, Craig Murray, Windsor cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. The most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on mitigation of climate change states that GHG emissions from the energy sector could be substantially reduced if coal-fired power plants are replaced with natural gas power plants. The report also states that natural gas power plants could act as a bridge technology and that natural gas could play an important role as a transition fuel (IPCC 2014). The Project will be designed and operated to adhere to provincial and federal GHG emission programs and policies. The Project will comply with the BC Carbon Tax system, and the majority of GHG emissions from the Project will originate from the combustion of fuel, for which the Project will pay carbon taxes. Aurora LNG will also adhere to the recently enacted requirements related to emission intensity benchmarks in the BC Greenhouse Gas Industrial Reporting and Control Act.
1005	2017-03-05	john pasqua, Escondido San Diego County	Dear EAO, Sincerely, john pasqua, Escondido San Diego County cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
1006	2017-03-05	Disa Hovatta, Victoria	Dear EAO, Please reject the Auroro LNG plant proposed for Digby Island. This area provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon and migrating birds. Concerns over the construction and eventual operation of the terminal are many. These include, but are not limited to: - gas flaring (hazard to migrating birds) - damage to wetlands and eelgrass habitat due to acidification - tanker traffic risks (spills, collisions and noise impacts on marine species). Further, the plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. The 24/7 operation of the plant and infrastructure would result in significant noise, light and air pollution. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of Dodge Cove residents were opposed to the project. The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. These First Nations rely on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year, essentially negating climate change initiatives. Sincerely, Disa Hovatta, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint. Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.

1007 (1 of 2)	2017-03-05	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Hammerfest is often quoted as being a "success" story by the LNG industry. The LNG terminal is 4 km from the city center, and always visible, on a rock island with nothing else on it in view of the city. Yet the city doubled the property tax on that land, and receives approx. 193 million Norwegian Krone per year ( \$22 million per year) in direct property tax alone from Statoil, and Statoil is 67% owned by the government of Norway, so there is also a major difference in direct benefits reaped by the city, and by the country. The below report talks about many of the issues that are also being felt, all that could easily (and some are already appearing) be felt here in the Pacific Northwest.</p> <p>"Eight respondents representing a wide range of different backgrounds highlighted the municipality's property tax system as central to reaping local economic benefits of the Snow White project (Interviewees 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 15, 16, 18). Property tax from Milk Island gives t he local municipality approximately NOK 157 million per year [64], while Hammerfest's revenue in 2013 totaled NOK 979.8 million [32].</p> <p>Despite broad support for oil and gas, an undercurrent emerged in some of the interviews, particularly with interviewees who were not directly involved in business development or politics. The tendency was to first talk about all the benefits of petroleum, telling a similar, apparently "official," sunshine story. After a while, the word "but" often appeared followed by negative side effects, the main being economic and social inequality and the increased price of housing and services, all of which make life harder for people who are not working in the petroleum industry.</p> <p>The social effects were described in different ways, including the transition from a simple life where most people knew each other, to a "harder" society with more focus on money and status. Words mentioned were "less focus on softer values" (Interviewee 1) and "increased class differences" (Interviewee 5). One interviewee explained: "The petroleum industry has led to, well, not exactly a snob factor, but money means more than before.... We still have our friends and visit each other but it has kind of become a bit 'colder.' People care more about status, [material] things and expensive cars. People talk about buying new snow scooters and where they are planning to travel. The petroleum industry has created an illusion that having much money is happiness. It was different before. Calmer" (Interviewee 15).</p> <p>It was also mentioned that Hammerfest should have been better prepared for the consequences of petroleum development, as explained by Interviewee 14: "In the construction phase, 3000–4000 people came here from different places. There were many cases of drugs and violence. Statoil should have planned for this.... It was not good for the local community—a tough time." Other negative effects include less focus on developing other livelihoods: "Everything in the municipality caters for oil and gas business; large industrial areas are made available for the sector. Meanwhile, other sectors, such as tourism, do not have as powerful spokespersons, and do not get prioritized" (Interviewee 1).</p> <p>Interviewees were often more reluctant about expressing negative opinions than positive ones. This may mean that negative opinions are controversial.</p> <p>The interviews with the three with the most critical view of the petroleum industry provide a different snapshot; their opinions are not socially accepted and those expressing opposition to petroleum are often the subject of social sanctions. Perhaps what is stated as being what "the people" want is not always representative of all local views or even evidence of a nearly total consensus—not to mention views of "people" from outside the community in question.</p> <p>Nevertheless, some petroleum supporters have been companies that are actively selling the benefits, rather than promoting a balanced discussion of the pros and cons. The lack of balance is further indicated by the hostility directed at outside opponents of petroleum. A narrative is built around the petroleum "adventure" and around boosting Hammerfest's self-confidence so that potential threats can be ignored and people with doubts silenced."</p> <p><a href="http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214629616300366">http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214629616300366</a></p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concern raised in the comment and appreciates the case study information brought to its attention. While the quoted publication was not referenced in the Application, the case study of Hammerfest was included in Section 13.5 of the Application. In addition to the case study of Hammerfest, numerous other case studies were also cited in the Application (particularly Sections 5.2 and 13.5). Case studies include; Kitimat, BC; Terrace BC; Williston, North Dakota; North Berwick, Main; and Gladstone, Australia.</p> <p>With respect to the quoted case study in the comment, the majority of themes, effect mechanisms and potential effects identified have been addressed in the economic and social environment sections of the Application. Please refer to the following sections of the Application for more information; 5.2 Economic Conditions, 6.2 Visual Quality, 6.3 Infrastructure and Service, 6.4 Land and Resource Use, 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters, 6.6 Community Health and Section 13.5 Public Consultation (subsection 'Issues and Concerns Not Addressed in Part B of the Application).</p>
1007 (2 of 2)	2017-03-05	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>This resonates so much with what has been happening in B.C., and in Prince Rupert. The public consultations aren't really meaningful at all but a slick media presentation by gas salesmen that could care less what the impacts to local populations will be. Divide and conquer has been the main strategy of oil and gas companies around the globe, and the same is true here in this area. The divisive environment makes it especially hard for people to step forward and express concerns about their safety and their homes, as there is always a backlash from someone.</p> <p>Another article had one interesting quote.</p> <p>"The city's deputy mayor, Marianne Sivertsen Næss, remembers seeing fires at the site, and ash raining down on Hammerfest."</p> <p><a href="http://www.popsoci.com/">http://www.popsoci.com/</a></p> <p>This would definitely be an issue for the community of Dodge Cove, at 1/2 km away, and the city of Prince Rupert, at 3 km away, from the proposed site for Aurora LNG.</p>	
1008	2017-03-06	Al Varty - Vancouver	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>All of these LNG projects are bad for the provinces environment. The people of BC will be paying for this foolishness for years. Stop the idiocy now</p> <p>Sincerely, Al Varty, Vancouver</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1009	2017-03-06	Jackie Suzanne - victoria	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. Auroa LNG project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p>Please protect this sacred area where the First Nations rely on salmon as their primary food source by not building an LNG Plant that could seriously impose the natural beauty of Prince Rupert and the Skeena River.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jackie Suzanne, victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1010	2017-03-06	Earl Richards, Victoria	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>There is something "fishy" going-on here. With a thousand miles of coast line, why is a site next to a salmon spawning area being selected?</p> <p>Sincerely, Earl Richards, Victoria</p> <p>cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

1011	2017-03-06	Jordie McTavish, Revelstoke	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>A massive LNG fracked fas plant owned by a Chinese oil giant is not what BC and Canada need. Carbon based fuels are also not what the world needs or wants. Profits for large corporations and risking the Skeena watershed is ludicrous. In BC we have sustainable fisheries upon which British Columbians rely upon for a living. This is yet another short sighted carbon based energy idea when we have yet to exercise the many carbon free energy alternatives.</p> <p>Please consider the people of British Columbians as well as the our unique wilderness represented by the Skeena watershed, salmon, Grizzly bears, and all that this fragile ecosystem represents.</p> <p>Yours, Jordie McTavish cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1012	2017-03-06	Ava P Christl, Victoria, B.C.	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>You already know the science - now you must listen to it. We need policies and practices that put people and place before profits. All the money in the world won't feed us when the rivers run dry and the fields are scorched. Governments at all levels need to be thinking about the future of all generations, not just the current one. We need to look for and implement solutions that protect the very resources needed to sustain life - water, air, soil. To do anything else is playing with our human fate. Is this how you want to be remembered?</p> <p>Sincerely, Ava P Christl, Victoria, B.C. cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1013	2017-03-06	Heather Ross, Bayfield Ontario	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I was born in Terrace.</p> <p>No. Do not risk such an extraordinary place.</p> <p>Sincerely, Heather Ross, Bayfield Ontario cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1014	2017-03-06	Patti VanderLinden, Calgary	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p><b>RORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds. The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of Dodge Cove residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b></p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patti VanderLinden, Calgary cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1015	2017-03-06	Liz Chisholm, Chilliwack	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>This has to stop! Your department's responsibility is to the citizens of British Columbia, and any economic benefits of this Aurora LNG project will be overshadowed by the threat to our salmon, our environment and our health. Do the right thing, for the right reasons, and remember who you represent.</p> <p>DO NOT approve of this project.</p> <p>I sign on behalf of my family of 4 children, 8 grand-children, 4 siblings, and their families.</p> <p>Sincerely, Liz Chisholm, Chilliwack cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

1016	2017-03-06	Carol Ponchet, Hazelton	<p>Dear EAO, Hello and thank you for taking the time to read my letter. I live in Hazelton, a ways up stream on the Skeena river. I am deeply distressed that the potential for an LNG facility any where near the Skeena estuary and Prince Rupert still exists. You must say 'No' to this dangerous possibility. The green house gas emissions alone should suffice to say No to this proposal. As well, it is well known that no LNG facility should be anywhere within 3.5 kms of human habitation because of the risk of explosion and noxious gases. Why even consider this proposal? It is sheer folly. Especially when there are so many other ways of producing energy and employment that are far cleaner and greener, friendlier to our environment and all the flora, fauna and people who live there. Please help protect this pristine and beautiful part of BC forever!</p> <p>Thank you! Sincerely, Carol Ponchet, Hazelton cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1017	2017-03-06	Sivalla Lin, Salt Spring Island	<p>Dear EAO, I am opposed to the LNG plant at Digby Island and Lelu Island. The Government should not develop industries that endanger salmon runs and coastal communities. Fracked gas is environmentally destructive. Clean, sustainable energy such as solar, wave and wind should be developed and used instead. Stop all LNG plans. Thank you, Sivalla Lin</p> <p>Sincerely, Sivalla Lin, Salt Spring Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1018	2017-03-06	Elizabeth Borek, Victoria	<p>Dear EAO, The Aurora LNG proposal violates international standards which call for a distance of 3.5 km between a plant and a community where people live. Approval of this project, which is only .5 km distant from the community, represents an attack of this government on the people Digby Island. It also endangers many species which are red and blue listed. Economically this project is insane. There is no need for this gas. BC will be destroying our precious and irreplaceable environment for nothing. Is this government so corrupt that life, even human, has no meaning?!!!</p> <p>Sincerely, Elizabeth Borek, Victoria cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1019	2017-03-06	Antonia Mills, Prince George	<p>Dear EAO, We have to stop each and every LNG processing plant that will damage the environment and the will salmon in our rivers. It is totally unacceptable to put the Aurora LNG processing plant in as it will impact humans as well as fish. It is time to stand up for what counts, and that is protecting humans and fish and the environment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Antonia Mills, Prince George cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1020	2017-03-06	David Carpenter, Stoddard	<p>Dear EAO, Please put the environment that our children and their children will inherit as a priority. What will you tell your grandchildren when they ask what you did to protect the environment. Say NO to the LNG development on Digby Island. Thank You for doing the right thing for the Planet. David &amp; Pat Carpenter.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Carpenter, Stoddard cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1021	2017-03-06	Kathleen Davies, Terrace	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Kathleen Davies, Terrace cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.



1022	2017-03-06	Deena Guffei, Vancouver	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing to share my concern about Aurora LNG affect on climate change, our community and wildlife.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS SALMON AND WILDLIFE</b></p> <p>The plant would be built beside Delusion Bay, which provides critical habitat for steelhead, coho and sockeye salmon. This habitat zone is considered to be as valuable as Flora Bank. Aurora LNG could pose risks similar to the risks posed to Flora Bank salmon by Petronas.</p> <p>Digby Island's ancient muskeg wetlands provide important habitat for migrating birds such as geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and song birds.</p> <p>The terminal's gas flaring would send burning gasses into the air along their migration routes and could pose other concerns for land wildlife. A proposed three-lane road, plant construction and acidification of the air and water would directly damage wetlands, important eel grass habitat and the area surrounding Delusion Bay, destroying bird nesting areas and blocking migration routes. Tanker noise would also cause significant impacts to the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</b></p> <p>The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of Dodge Cove residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved.</p> <p><b>AURORA LNG THREATENS OUR CLIMATE</b></p> <p>As BC's largest LNG facility to date, this fracked gas plant would produce 6.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year! And that doesn't even count the emissions involved in plant construction, shipping and burning of this fossil fuel in Asia. This project would smash through BC's legislated climate targets and blow our carbon budget..</p> <p>Please do the right thing and not move forward with this project.. Canada needs to be investing in RENEWABLE energy that does not threaten life and our planet.</p> <p>Sincerely, Deena Guffei, Vancouver cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1023	2017-03-06	Mike Seyfried, Boulder City	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am writing you today in regards to the proposed Aurora LNG plant to be built near Prince Rupert. I urge you to consider the following points during your deliberations.</p> <p>International tanker regulations state that ALL LNG facilities should be at least 3.5 kms away from any community - where humans need to breathe the air, drink the water and live daily lives!</p> <p>At the mouth of Prince Rupert harbour, the proposed Aurora LNG Project (CNOOC-NEXEN) would emit 91 Million GHGs and other toxins, compared to the illustrious Petronas LNG plant, calculated to emit 85 million tonnes!</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mike Seyfried, Boulder City cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1024	2017-03-06	Kaaren soby, Telkwa	<p>Dear EAO...we live in the MOST pristine, most beautiful, most wild and free and spiritually imbued part,of,the world enjoyed by people around the Globe,cherished by the locals and foreigners alike. Your project,WILL destroy not only the Economics of the region ,but,the land and mammal wildlife, vast ecosystems which need to flourish in order to support all of us sharing in life on earth</p> <p>It is a diabolical,unconscious, rapacious and ignorant beyond belief plan to destroy life on this sacred planet of ours. I hope beyond hope that you come to your senses and realize the vastness of destruction you are catalyzing</p> <p>Sincerely, Kaaren soby, Telkwa cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns expressed in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including for the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to economic conditions, marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be manageable with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p>
1025	2017-03-06	Neal Hoffberg, Issaquah	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I stand with the Ierra Club of B.C. And the skeena watershed in asking you to block the developments of the Aurora LNG project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Neal Hoffberg, Issaquah cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1026	2017-03-06	Annette Witteman, Mayne Island	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Please become aware that any small disruption of Salmon habitat is disastrous for their continued survival.</p> <p>Big Industry can not possibly put in measures which will indefinitely protect the wild life who breath the water that surround their projects. I stand for the Ocean -Our Earths Lungs -I stand for the creatures who can not plea for their lives- NO LNG! NO TANKS!</p> <p>Sincerely, Annette Witteman, Mayne Island cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

1027 (1 of 5)	2017-03-06	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I have concerns about what the dredging would do to both the fish populations that we depend on for food and for making a living (whether directly or indirectly) and also what that could do to our health. The impacts to our food have been looked at a little bit, but have studies such as the impact that dredging has had on the Gladstone area been looked at? Since dredging has taken place there, that area has seen a total collapse of marine life, making local businesses shut down. Why should Aurora LNG be approved, and allowed to dredge in the sensitive Skeena River estuary habitat when all evidence points to death for fish and marine life?</p> <p>"The southwest shore of Lelu Island and Delusion Bay are highly valuable habitats for neritic feeding species (e.g., Coho, sockeye, and steelhead). With all of these potential projects on the horizon, flat land for development, especially land owned by the Port of Prince Rupert, is in short supply, thus forcing some of the projects into serious trade-offs between deep-water access and sufficient land for site development. Increased vessel traffic associated with these planned terminals, as well as potential oil tanker activity from proposed projects such as the Enbridge Northern Gateway, will also increase the possibility of spills and other marine accidents. Although estuaries provide essential nursery and juvenile rearing habitats, with up to 80% of coastal wildlife species relying on estuaries during at least one stage of their life history (BCMOE 2006), they frequently occur in areas highly valued for industrial development.</p> <p>What has changed in our environment that has now allowed this region to be considered a prime site for industrial development?</p> <p>Estuaries worldwide are often areas of conflict between human resource need and environmental sustainability. This is further exacerbated by a site-by-site approach to habitat protection, which often saves sensitive habitat from destruction by one project only to have the same piece of habitat threatened by a neighboring project. A more holistic approach to habitat protection is required, underpinned by a thorough scientific understanding of the roles and vulnerabilities of the different species and habitats in the estuarine environment. In order to implement this approach, there is a need to better understand the cumulative, and often complex, anthropogenic impacts on estuarine environments."</p> <p><a href="http://www.oceanecology.ca/Juvenile%20salmon.htm">http://www.oceanecology.ca/Juvenile%20salmon.htm</a></p> <p>"What is Gladstone's LNG development really doing to the environment?" October 19, 2011 3.23pm EDT</p> <p>Fish and other marine life have been infected by a strange parasite that seemed to make the leap to humans. The outbreak led to a local fishing ban which was recently overturned, despite lingering concerns about water quality and the health of fish.</p> <p>Some commentators have suggested liquified natural gas (LNG) developments on nearby Curtis Island could be responsible for the ill health of marine life and the flow-on effects.</p> <p>So what sort of assessments were done to predict the environmental effects of LNG developments? Was enough done? And what will be the long-term effects for the local environment and the people of Gladstone?</p> <p>Fundamentally flawed</p> <p>Quite simply, the Gladstone case highlights the flaws in the environmental impact assessment and approvals processes overseen by state and federal governments.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1027 (2 of 5)	2017-03-06	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In order to start a project such as the one on Curtis Island, LNG companies are required to carry out environmental impacts assessments (EISs). These assessments must be approved by the state government and by the Commonwealth, if the type of environmental damage is covered under Commonwealth legislation – in the case of biodiversity impacts, for example.</p> <p>Notably, these EISs are done by private companies hired by the businesses backing the project.</p> <p>Dredging the Gladstone Harbour</p> <p>The massive development of Gladstone Harbour – including dredging to allow large LNG vessels through – will cause many environmental and social problems, the extent of which has not been settled in EISs.</p> <p>Fishy business</p> <p>Fish habitats in Gladstone harbour will also be diminished by the project. New wharves are being created on top of sea grass beds. The dredging stirs up silt which remains in suspension in harbour waters, affecting the ability of fish to extract oxygen from the water, before settling out on sea grasses and wetlands.</p> <p>The quantity of food available for both commercial and recreational targeted fishes is thus diminished.</p> <p>The environmental effects will be long term. Dredging will continue to at least 2015, and the sea grass beds that are smothered will take some years to recover after dredging stops.</p> <p>Another impediment to fishing is vessel traffic in the harbour. Hundreds of workers and materials need to be ferried to Curtis Island daily, and LNG vessels and their wharves have large exclusion zones around them.</p> <p>The economic future of commercial fishermen using the harbour is not nearly as emotive an issue as damage to the Great Barrier Reef. But it is another cost of the development that has often been minimised in EISs and by the Coordinator General.</p> <p>Social impacts assessments in the EISs suggest only a handful of fishing businesses will be adversely affected. But it is obvious that harbour-wide impacts affect – and will continue to affect – the livelihoods of a considerable number of fishing families.</p> <p>Furthermore, local wholesaling, processing and exporting businesses will find it difficult to survive the reduction in supply of local fish.</p> <p>An issue avoided in social impact assessments is the serious economic impact of the scarcity of skilled and unskilled labour on fishing and wholesaling businesses. These cannot compete with the high levels of remuneration offered by the transport, dredging and building companies operating in the harbour.</p> <p>It's time for change</p> <p>Given the massive economic and tax benefits to both state and Commonwealth governments of LNG developments, there is a conflict of interest when these same governments make environmental assessments.</p> <p>Moreover, the chances of these judgements being biased are exacerbated when the EISs are put together by the project developers themselves.</p> <p>Something needs to change to mitigate the inevitable damage done under the present assessment system by large projects such as LNG.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

1027 (3 of 5)	2017-03-06	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>It would be costly to mandate that independent bodies carry out environmental and social assessments and reviews of projects. Nevertheless it is a solution that should be considered."</p> <p><a href="http://theconversation.com/what-is-gladstones-Ing-development-really-doing-to-the-environment-3885">http://theconversation.com/what-is-gladstones-Ing-development-really-doing-to-the-environment-3885</a></p> <p>Youtube videos regarding Dredging problems in Gladstone and affect to local fish/seafood <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWkISQDRxdE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWkISQDRxdE</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-nGtbQmd-I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-nGtbQmd-I</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=abt0mlu5cys">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=abt0mlu5cys</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=muCc-W9X7og">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=muCc-W9X7og</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yF89lvngy-I">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yF89lvngy-I</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGsa_-5uh-Q">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGsa_-5uh-Q</a></p> <p>GLADSTONE DEAD ZONE FOR MARINE CREATURES Posted on September 2, 2012 by Sue (More dead fish and animals)</p> <p>"surfaced in the murky Gladstone Harbour controversy following recent claims by Fisheries Queensland that sick fish were getting better. Commercial fishers have scoffed at the suggestion and in the past few weeks The Queensland Telegraph has been told of at least six dead turtles, five dead barramundi, three very sick barramundi, two dead dugong and other diseased catches.</p> <p>Pictures and statements relating to some of these have been sent to Law Essentials, the Queensland firm co-venturing with Shine Lawyers in the fishers' compensation case, with a court judgement pending.</p> <p>The more alarming claims made to the Telegraph include a "clean- up crew" patrolling the harbour day and night to remove dead or sick fish and marine animals, and a statement that Bio Security Queensland has informed fisheries officers there would be no further tests on diseased seafood "unless it was a new disease".</p> <p>" This fish situation is not fixed, not going away and not getting better. Fishermen are leaving; they are pushing people to the limits with stress levels and they are dropping out," he said.</p> <p>Fisher Gary Otto of Turkey Beach agrees. He knows one colleague who fished the same area, Chris Putman, who left for Hervey Bay this month because of diseased and depleted catches.</p> <p>The Telegraph recently reported the Otto family's personal health battles after coming in contact with a toxic algae, "lyngbya majuscula, while cleaning their nets. He said then that up to 30 percent of his catch was diseased, he had pulled in a barramundi that was "alive but absolutely rotten" and he and his son were constantly fighting skin infections over the past 12 months.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
1027 (4 of 5)	2017-03-06	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Since then he had given up fishing the Turkey area but a couple of weeks ago he had taken his grandson fishing to Seven Mile Creek and they had caught a large blubber lip bream and a mullet which were both heavily diseased.</p> <p>" I have another diseased barra alive in a tank to see how long it lives," he said.</p> <p>Mr Otto said he had recently been fishing a few nights up in Gladstone Harbour when he had been approached by an unmarked boat "not a government fisheries boat," whose crew were wearing orange work shirts.</p> <p>" Their job was to clean up any mess, any dead fish or turtles, before the public sees them," he claimed.</p> <p>Besides the toll on Turtle Island, The Telegraph has also taken photographs of three dead turtles at Tannum Sands recently, the latest at Canoe Point last week.</p> <p>About the same time a report was received of campers encountering a couple of dead barramundi and a dugong at Point Richards, south of Turkey Beach.</p> <p>(*Toxic lyngbya algae is known to cause severe reactions including skin rashes and asthma like symptoms in humans and is also dangerous to marine animals. Blooms are associated with increased nutrient levels, sometimes following dredging, as reported in Moreton Bay following dredging of the Gold Coast Broadwater)."</p> <p><a href="http://www.greatbarrierreef.org.au/gladstone-dead-zone-for-marine-creatures/">http://www.greatbarrierreef.org.au/gladstone-dead-zone-for-marine-creatures/</a></p> <p>"THE sickness plaguing a central Queensland fishery has spread to prawns and other species.</p> <p>There is no end in sight to the crisis which has decimated the fishing industry in the burgeoning port of Gladstone.</p> <p>"Harbour water is absolutely filthy from dredging." Dr Gardner said."</p> <p><a href="http://www.couriermail.com.au/business/devastating-disease-spreads-from-fish-to-other-marine-species-at-gladstone/news-story/daba804ba134e60d7ffc4513c8cb7ee3">http://www.couriermail.com.au/business/devastating-disease-spreads-from-fish-to-other-marine-species-at-gladstone/news-story/daba804ba134e60d7ffc4513c8cb7ee3</a></p> <p>The Dead and Diseased Marine Animals in the Gladstone Harbour "Between May 2011 and early 2012 a number of marine animals began dying in the Gladstone Harbour. They included turtles, dugongs, fish, crabs, sharks and stingrays. Many more were found to be suffering from diseases, most featuring red spots, lesions and parasites. We believe that the cause was more simple, and was a result of the wholesale stripping of seagrass meadows in the Gladstone Harbour in the latter part of 2010. In this article we shall explain why.</p> <p>The State Government accepted these claims and approved the seagrass removal, even though it acknowledged that turtles, dugongs and dolphins would be displaced from their habitats. The Government claimed that the project is not expected to have a significant net negative effect on the diversity of the systems within the Port Curtis region, nor is it expected to have flow-on impacts to the communities that use the habitats within the project area. It may well have been right too, if only 89.18 ha of seagrass had been removed.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

1027 (5 of 5)	2017-03-06	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>But the 89.18 ha figure was a lie. A fiction. A sham. 418.2 ha was removed or died around the dredging area in just months. Both the GPC and the Queensland Government had noted in their EIS statements that seagrass in the vicinity of the project area may suffer impacts resulting in the smothering of existing substrates by sediments settling from the water column during the dredging and decant activities for the project, but the Government believed (or so it said) that the GPC's modelling indicating that the sediment from the dredging would fall where it was dug was true. Someone should have told them how tidal waters work. The sediment from the dredging – which the GPC and the Government claimed would settle where it was dug – was in fact carried by the moving waters and spread across the harbour, choking seagrass meadows far and wide. Imagine throwing tonnes of toxic dirt on your lawn and you will begin to understand exactly what happened. Over 600 additional hectares of seagrass died across the harbour. Soon sick fish started appearing near the dredge site. Then sick crabs; and turtles; and dolphin, and dugong. Then the barramundi that were washed over the Awoonga Dam spillway began to arrive in the harbour. They soon became ill too. The food chain had been disrupted by the removal of all the seagrass. There was nothing to eat. The water became more turbid because there were no seagrass roots to stabilise the seabed. The marine life got sick, and many fish, dugongs, turtles, crabs and prawns died. Sure, there were various contributing factors such as water quality, increased schools of barramundi, and salinity issues. But the base cause was that the seagrass meadows had been destroyed."</p> <p><a href="https://itsnotnormalisit.com/2015/03/10/exposing-the-ports-corporations-lies-the-truth-about-gladstone-harbour-part-1-the-slaughter-of-the-seagrass/">https://itsnotnormalisit.com/2015/03/10/exposing-the-ports-corporations-lies-the-truth-about-gladstone-harbour-part-1-the-slaughter-of-the-seagrass/</a></p>	
1028	2017-03-06	Carolyn Henry - Vernon, British Columbia	I say "NO" to this LNG building in such a beautiful place. Let our families and families to come have no such thing on their land.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1029	2017-03-06	Alan Burger, President BC Nature	<p>The attached submission has the support of BC Nature (Federation of BC Naturalists) representing 53 naturalist clubs around BC with over 6,000 members. BC Nature is strongly opposed to this proposed LNG plant for numerous reasons, primarily because of the the unavoidable impacts to wildlife and several listed threatened species. Our letter documents this in detail.</p> <p>Dear Mr. Moore:</p> <p>The attached submission has the support of BC Nature (Federation of BC Naturalists) representing 53 naturalist clubs around BC with over 6,000 members. BC Nature is strongly opposed to this proposed LNG plant for numerous reasons, primarily because of the the unavoidable impacts to wildlife and several listed threatened species. Our letter documents this in detail.</p> <p>Dear Mr. Moore:</p> <p>BC Nature is a non-profit federation of 53 naturalists societies in British Columbia totalling over 6,000 members. We are writing to express our concerns about this proposed project. These concerns were brought to our attention by several of our member clubs and many individual members. The proposed location for the LNG complex and its infrastructure, including roads and utilities associated with the project, will have a direct impact on the wetlands, bogs, and forests of Digby Island. Digby Island, a low elevation coastal island, supports important populations of terrestrial coastal wildlife. Found within the proposed Aurora LNG project area are medium to high value breeding habitats for amphibians, including Northwestern Salamanders and provincially Blue-listed and federally SARA-listed Western Toads. In addition the island has Little Brown Myotis bat roosting habitat (SARA: Endangered), suitable breeding habitat for Marbled Murrelet (SARA: Threatened), and nesting habitat of the coastal Great Blue Heron (SARA: Special Concern). As the Aurora Environmental Assessment documents, there are several other listed species recorded in the proposed LNG project area.</p> <p>Of species interest to us are the Western Toads on Digby Island. Western Toads are listed as a species of Special Concern under the federal Species at Risk Act and are listed as a Blue-listed species in British Columbia. In the EAC Certificate Application by Aurora LNG, the Assessment of Potential Environmental Effects section of the application, there is an acknowledgment that this project will directly affect important breeding habitat for the healthy population of toads on the island (quoting Section 4.7-24: "there are 582 ha (21% of the terrestrial portion of the Local Assessment Area) of moderate to high breeding habitat for Western Toads"). Approximately 50% of the high suitability breeding habitat is located within the proposed industrial site for dumping and storing organic soils removed for plant construction. Western Toads have been identified as a species eligible for a Western Canada management plan under SARA. It is our concern that this population of island Western Toads has not been adequately studied and requires protection from development. Of special concerns are the losses of wetland habitat proposed in the Aurora LNG plan and the impacts of toad mortality by vehicle traffic. Impacts by losses of medium to high value breeding habitat for this isolated island population of Western Toads would be significant. Additional detailed studies are needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-investigating the genetics of these Digby Island toads to determine if this is a unique isolated genotype;</li> <li>-quantifying the utilization of specific breeding and rearing habitat sites; and</li> <li>-an independent assessment of which sites should be protected.</li> </ul>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.

1030 (1 of 2)	2017-03-06	Alan Burger, President BC Nature	<p>Part 2:</p> <p>As most of the south end of the island, where the project is proposed to be located, is covered by bogs, and the toad population has stabilized to the current availability of breeding and feeding habitat, removal of wetlands will only lead to a reduction in the toad population. Relocating toads to areas already occupied by other stable local populations of toads is unlikely to provide adequate compensation for habitat loss.</p> <p>Change in mortality rates is also an important factor. The south end of Digby Island within the proposed development area for Aurora LNG, currently does not have any roads suitable for vehicles. Road and industrial pad development would be an entirely new addition to toad mortality, and as presented in the Aurora application, "increased vehicle traffic will increase the risk of mortality for migrating amphibians such as the western toad dispersing between wetland breeding habitat and forested overwintering habitat."</p> <p>There is voluminous research showing that roadkill is a critical factor for survival of both adult toads and tiny migrating toadlets (metamorphs) throughout their range. Western Toads have high breeding site fidelity which increases their risks when roads and other development encroach on their habitat. This high fidelity also negates the "mitigation" measures that Aurora proposes. Adult Western Toads are strongly nocturnal, and, based on the monitoring observations by one of our member Societies in the vicinity of the community of Dodge Cove, these toads also come out on to open, warmed surfaces (such as the proposed roads and industrial pads for Aurora LNG) to feed on insects at night during the spring, summer and fall months, making them highly vulnerable to roadkill. Please see Canada's SARA management plan for Western Toads which clearly documents these traits and risks to toads: <a href="https://www.registrelp-sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/plans/mp-western-toad-e-proposed.pdf">https://www.registrelp-sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/plans/mp-western-toad-e-proposed.pdf</a>.</p> <p>It is unlikely that adherences to speed limits and group transportation will be adequate mitigation measures to reduce toad roadkill. The proposed roads pass directly through Western Toad habitat, and the industrial pads will displace habitat currently used by the toads. At minimum, if the project proceeds, mitigation measures should include a high density of toad tunnels under roadways and amphibian fencing along roadways and around industrial pads. It should also include careful consideration as to the location of any facilities and infrastructure to minimize losses of wetlands. It does appear, though, that this proposed project, in its current proposed location, is in direct conflict with the continued existence and wellbeing of Western Toad populations on the south end of Digby Island.</p> <p>We suggest that inadequate attention has been placed on assessing the impacts to Blue-listed Western Toads in the Aurora LNG proposal. We urge that both Environment and Climate Change Canada and the Provincial Ministry of Environment be closely involved in ensuring the wellbeing and longevity of this population of island-constrained Western Toads. We suggest that Digby Island is an inappropriate location for this large Aurora LNG project and urge the governments and proponent to look elsewhere for a less damaging location. At the very least, if the proposed Aurora LNG facility is approved on Digby Island, we urge all regulatory authorities to place stringent restrictions on the location, design and use of roads, pads and other constructions to minimize their impacts on Western Toads and the other wildlife that currently use Digby Island.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the Project to terrestrial wildlife.</p> <p>Western toad was identified as a focal species with potential to interact with Project activities and infrastructure. Field studies and habitat suitability modelling were completed to characterize existing conditions for western toad on Digby Island in order to develop effective mitigation measures for this species. Table 4.7-17 outlines the mitigation measures that Aurora LNG is committing to, to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential Project effects to western toad. These include habitat protections, relocation efforts, and measures to reduce traffic speed and volume. However, Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by local Aboriginal groups, communities, and government agencies on the potential for injury or mortality during dispersal. Based on the characterization of current western toad habitat use and distribution, in combination with the feedback received from stakeholders, Aurora LNG is further committing to facilitating amphibian passage while reducing potential for harm. As per mitigation 4.7.12, drift fencing will be installed along sections of roadway to direct dispersing individuals away from the access road and towards passage corridors (e.g., culverted riparian crossings).</p> <p>Western toad observations during Project field studies show a reasonable verification of the habitat suitability model (Figures 6 and 10 of Appendix J of the Application). Western toads were detected more frequently and in larger numbers in, or adjacent to high and moderate suitability polygons within the LAA. Adult and juvenile dispersing western toads appeared to have some association with riparian corridors within the LAA, however, no large migration events were observed in these areas. Drift fencing installed along riparian corridors that intersect with the access road are expected to be effective in reducing potential for injury or mortality in these locations.</p> <p>To further reduce potential residual effects of the Project to western toad, guidelines for restricted activity periods to protect amphibians will be followed where practicable (BC MOE 2014; BC MFLNRO 2014). Clearing activities will occur outside of the breeding season for amphibians (March 1 through August 15), where possible. In accordance with mitigation measure 4.7.19, if clearing or disturbance of open water wetland sites within the PDA cannot avoid the amphibian breeding period, salvage will be completed subject to permit approval under the BC Wildlife Act. Procedures for amphibian salvage will be outlined in the Wildlife Management Plan and will be conducted following Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia (BC MFLNRO 2016). Amphibian salvage during the breeding season is expected to be an effective means of reducing the likelihood of mortality as individuals are concentrated at breeding locations, and the ability to detect and capture individuals of all life stages (e.g., eggs, tadpoles or larvae, juveniles, or adults) is improved. Salvaged individuals will be relocated, subject to applicable permits, to proximal areas of suitable habitat beyond the PDA boundaries. Wetland habitats on Digby Island with similar habitat attributes and/or where western toads were previously detected will be preferred relocation areas. The collective measures that Aurora LNG is committing to reduce effects to western toad are expected to be effective in maintaining the viability of toad populations on Digby Island.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1030 (2 of 2)	2017-03-06	Alan Burger, President BC Nature	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>We have focused on Western Toads in this submission, but we strongly urge you to take into serious consideration the impacts on the other listed species known to use this area. From the information provided by the Aurora EA and information obtained by BC Nature naturalists who know the area well, it is clear that this project will have a major impact on many species. The Highest Habitat suitability for the Marbled Murrelet is all within the structural boundaries of the proposed LNG plant. Moderate and low suitability are also within this potential site as well as nearby. The majority of the High Suitability all-season habitat suitability (60% by our naturalists' estimation) for the Western Screech-Owl (Kennicott subspecies) on map 4.7-4 is also within the proposed LNG site. At least 80% of the highest Roosting Habitat Suitability for the Endangered Little Brown Myotis within the local assessment area is in the proposed LNG site.</p> <p>The proponent in this project is touting mitigation for the habitat loss that will result in their project. As a professional biologist with 30 years of experience working on wildlife habitat, especially that of the Marbled Murrelet, I know that there is no way to mitigate the loss of old-growth forest, functioning marshlands and other key ecosystems on Digby Island. The BC Nature members who know this area well concur.</p> <p>Overall, it seems that the impacts on listed species, functioning ecosystems and local people on Digby Island cannot be ignored and we urge that this proposal be rejected.</p> <p>Yours truly, Alan Burger, PhD President - BC Nature (Federation of BC Naturalists)</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Regarding potential effects to other wildlife species at risk, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy, and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and Aurora LNG has also identified 23 mitigation measures that will be implemented to further reduce potential effects to terrestrial wildlife. A Wildlife Management Plan will be developed to outline detailed mitigation measures for wildlife and will include additional protection measures for other species at risk such as great blue heron. Separate Marbled Murrelet and Bat Management Plans will be developed to outline measures to avoid, reduce, and mitigate for effects to marbled murrelet and little brown myotis consistent with federal and provincial recovery objectives for both species. Please see Table 4.7-17 for a complete list of measures that Aurora LNG is committing to, to avoid or reduce potential residual effects for wildlife species at risk.</p> <p>References; British Columbia Ministry of Environment (BC MOE). 2014. Develop with Care 2014; Environmental Guidelines for Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia. Available at: <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main</a>. Accessed; April 2016. British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2014. A Compendium of Wildlife Guidelines for Industrial Development Projects in the North Area, British Columbia, Interim Guidance, North Area. 212 pp. BC Ministry of Forest, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2016. Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia. Victoria, BC. 57 pp.</p>
1031	2017-03-06	Nancy Fischer - Crippen Cove - Digby Island	<p>What a waste of a beautiful place. You should be developing solar &amp; tidal power instead!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1032	2017-03-06	Deena Guffei - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>My concern is in regards to the proposed LNG project affecting Digby Island. The operations would be 0.5 kms away from the community of Dodge Cove and only 3 kms away from Prince Rupert. International tanker regulations state that ALL LNG facilities should be at least 3.5 kms away from any community - where humans need to breathe the air, drink the water and live daily lives! This along with the massive amounts of green house gas emissions generated and fracking are very concerning for me.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1033	2017-03-06	Ruth Brady - Hazelton, British Columbia	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed Aurora LNG facility proposed for Digby Island. This project can not be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>According to the Society of International Tanker &amp; Terminal Operators, LNG facilities should not be built within 3.5 KM of any community. The residential area on Digby Island is .5 KM from the proposed facility and Prince Rupert is 3 KM away.</p> <p>There would be a significant impact on fishing and tourism which provides the Province with hundreds of millions of dollars annually - in particular the Salmon. Putting Salmon at risk is tantamount to genocide of the First Nations that depend on the Salmon for their livelihood.</p> <p>We are trying to reduce our greenhouse gases and this project alone would add 15 tonnes of CO2 to our Provincial totals.</p> <p>Please. DO NOT LET THE PROJECT HAPPEN.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1034	2017-03-06	Antonia Mills - Prince George, British Columbia	<p>Note that the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project does not meet the specifications that such sites must be 3.5 km from a place of human habitation. Both the people and the environment would be harmed by its presence at the proposed site.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

1035	2017-03-07	Elaine Fischer, Roanoke	Dear EAO, Sincerely, Elaine Fischer, Roanoke cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.
1036	2017-03-07	JIM MCROBERTS, BELLEVUE	Dear EAO, The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. Sincerely, JIM MCROBERTS, BELLEVUE cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1037	2017-03-07	Sally Soanes - Parksville, British Columbia	British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG This Aurora project is so polluting I really don't know how it can possibly be approved. It also violates the international siting standards. The site is so close to bird breeding grounds. By approving this project you are showing what BC now stands for. Big bucks talk and get approved here and climate change, the environment and its residents don't matter at all. Sadly Sally Soanes Parksville, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1038	2017-03-07	Linda Kemp - Quesnel, British Columbia	British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents. Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic. Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island. This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions. Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk! Linda Kemp Quesnel, BC cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.
1039	2017-03-07	Keith Cociani - Prince George, British Columbia	This is far to large an industrial project to be put so close to Dodge Cove. I am most concerned about the massive NO2 emissions, inevitable when burning such a massive amount of fossil fuel. Even a clean fuel like natural gas burned in that volume produces huge amounts of NO2 which will acidify the very sensitive environment on Digby Island.	Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns expressed in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including for the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO + NO2 = NOx) are not solely a function of the amount of natural gas burned. Emission quality is also dictated by the emission control technology employed during or following combustion. NOx emissions are not related to any constituent of natural gas (which mainly methane-CH4) - a clean fuel which does not contain nitrogen. Instead, NOx is produced by nitrogen (N2) in air splitting and atomic nitrogen (N) combining with atomic oxygen in a high temperature combustion environment. Aurora LNG plans to employ technology in its combustion turbines and other fired equipment that will manage combustion in a way that limits NOx production which in turn will limit potential acidic deposition. Potential effects of acidification and eutrophication on freshwater habitats on Digby Island and surrounding areas, from atmospheric deposition, have been assessed in Section 4.5 of the Application.

1040	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I am writing a comment after reading a public comment that was released online on March 4th.</p> <p>Here is the direct quote: "I support the Aurora LNG project. Recently, they held a community information session in Prince Rupert where I learned that most of the development will be 3-4km from Dodge Cove. I initially had concerns that the facility may be too close to the community for their comfort but this put my mind at ease." So this person, who has been fed false information by CNOOC-Nexen regarding the proximity of the project to Dodge Cove (and I must say Prince Rupert) now believes that the Aurora LNG terminal isn't very close to communities. What kind of public information session is this - where false information and lies are given to the public - which is then said to be "informing the public" about the project, and "true consultation"?</p> <p>In one little tiny comment (very easy to miss) - in an Aurora LNG news bulletin that was printed and also released online, CNOOC-Nexen actually did admit that they were 3 km to Prince Rupert (Prince Rupert, not Dodge Cove, which the person who went to the open house is claiming they were told 3 km to Dodge Cove). Was this person told that the Project Development Area overlaps and removes green space from the Dodge Cove Official Community Plan in a major way? Was this person informed that the 3 lane highway for the project is to run through the essential watershed that feeds the Dodge Cove Water Dam (in the Final Application for Aurora little is mentioned about our water dam and weird statements such as "the stream that possibly supplies water to the community" and all avoidance of the actual name of the dam even though it has a big sign that Nexen employees would have seen the ONE time they came to take a water sample)? Was this person informed that residents of Dodge Cove would be living in a toxic air quality area according to the recent cumulative air effects report for Prince Rupert? Air quality laws are clear about what levels of pollutants are allowed and Dodge Cove will be in the RED (think DEAD) zone!! Was this person informed that the residents of Dodge Cove have long been speaking out about the proximity of this project and how close it actually is at 1/2 km to less than 500 metres from our homes? Was this person informed that Dodge Cove residents were driven crazy by helicopter traffic by Nexen "Investigative Use License" in which they clearcut approx. 120 areas as large as my house on our island, on undisturbed habitat that supports many red and blue listed species? Driven crazy by the constant loud noise of rotating chopper blades behind and beside our homes, to where residents complained about the noise? Was this person told that residents had raised these issues to the Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resources before they approved the IUL, and that none of the concerns of Dodge Cove residents were responded to - including site location and proximity!! No, this person was reassured by CNOOC-Nexen employees that the project was 3-4 km away from us (impossible distance measures - did the maps at the open house show the Dodge Cove OCP and the overlapping of Aurora LNG PDA across it??)and no problem at all. Who oversees the information distributed at these open houses? These open houses are to properly inform the public, not just present the lies from the proponent, in this case Aurora LNG, and the complete disregard of everything that the Dodge Cove residents have been trying to make public (the proximity) is so infuriating!!! This entire public consultation process is a joke. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tg1cMNUHgpl&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tg1cMNUHgpl&amp;feature=youtu.be</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment. For reference, Section 6.4.3 of the Application provides an approximate distance from the centre of the PDA to the nearest private lands in Dodge Cove as 2km. For clarification, the nearest project development (PDA) boundary to Dodge Cove is approximately 165 m from the nearest property line (PID 004264479) or 265 m to the nearest dwelling on that property. Within the PDA, the nearest development (i.e., the access road) is approximately 450 m to the nearest property line (PID 007506228) or 515 m from the nearest dwelling on that property. It should be noted that the PDA is the maximum predicted area of potential disturbance as defined for assessment purposes. However, the proposed infrastructure within the PDA is located closer to the middle or south end. As detailed in Figure 1.7 of the Application, the closest proposed facility (i.e., power plant) to Dodge Cove is 1,350 m and this facility is approximately 945 m to the closest property line (PID 004264479) or 1,045 m from the nearest dwelling on that property. Aurora LNG is aware of Dodge Cove's concerns related to the proximity of the proposed access road to the community and its water supply. To address these concerns, Aurora LNG has revised the corridor for the access road to shift the proposed road to the west side of an elevated ridge and outside of the watershed that drains into the Dodge Cove drinking water supply. At its closest point, the modified access road is approximately 550 meters from Dodge Cove with trees and an elevated ridge between the proposed road and the community (the original access road was approximately 200 meters from Dodge Cove). The shift to the west will mitigate concerns regarding potential effects on the drinking water supply and the increased distance along with the elevated ridge and treed area will mitigate potential effects of road dust and vehicle noise to residents of Dodge Cove. (For more information regarding potential effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water supply and a map of the modified access road, refer to the "Dodge Cove Water Supply and Watershed" technical memo, which will be filed with the BC EAO). Assessed in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and noted in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application), the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically: 1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people). 2. Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels. 3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</p>
1041	2017-03-07	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>RE: the Statements of Personal Impact by Dodge Cove residents for the Proposed Aurora LNG Development</p> <p>As a community, we were advised by the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) to submit Statements of Personal Impact. Many of the observations and comments contained in the Personal Impact Statements have been submitted as public comments already, so there will be some inevitable repetition. This collection is to help the employees of the EAO gather the data that spells out our Social Impacts. These statements are "I" statements; this is how some of the people on Digby Island feel about some of the past, present and future effects our community is experiencing. Many of these concerns are addressed in the EA, but not to the satisfaction, by and large, of the residents of Digby Island, whose main premise remains that the Aurora LNG Project should not be built here. Lou Allison, compiler.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges receipt of the statements of personal impact. Responses to each statement of personal impact are provided as separate comments.</p>
1042 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Public Impact Re: the Proposed Aurora LNG Development</p> <p>Lou Allison - property owner, small business owner, resident of Dodge Cove</p> <p>In a lengthy public comment, I have listed some of my concerns with both the Environmental Assessment process and the Proposed Aurora LNG Project. In this statement, I would like to address some of the personal issues that have arisen in the ensuing of this project: 1 - concerns about siting: I feel that this enormous project is much too close to our community of Dodge Cove, and that the Province, in its refusal to enact properly considered siting guidelines, is allowing corporate interests, rather than the protection and welfare of its citizens, dictate its agenda. This is an enormous betrayal. Also, siting the plant at the restricted mouth of a busy Port is sheer folly. The increase in large and small vessel traffic as other sectors of the economy continue to develop (cruise ships, ferries, container-carrying freighters, bulk freight carriers, log ships, pellet-carrying ships, fishing vessel, recreational boaters, canoers, kayakers, on and on...). My husband and I frequently go out into Chatham Sound in one of our small boats, fishing, beach-combing, whale-watching, touring visitors, and visiting relatives who live on Porcher Island: what is that going to be like with the huge jetty and security perimeters around the LNG loading? 2 - concerns about health impacts: I am worried about the effect of emissions on air and water quality; also the effect of noise pollution as we are already suffering in Dodge Cove from a large increase in noise from the Container Port (which is expanding exponentially) and Pellet-Loading Facility (ditto). The constant helicopter noise resulting from the proponent's work under their License for Investigative Use was extremely onerous, and bodes poorly for the future. We are dreading its resumption, after a hiatus for the winter. 3 - concerns about the environment: as an organic gardener with a property listed with the Canadian Wildlife Federation, and an avid naturalist, I am very concerned about the local wildlife, marine and terrestrial, from polluting insects to whales. I am very concerned about the loss of a large and important part of Digby Island, with its fragile bogs, and Delusion Bay, an important stop for migrating birds and important habitat for harbour porpoises, which are relatively abundant in the area and localized in their habits. Losing these important close-to-home habitats and species is heart-breaking. 4 - concerns about heritage: I am saddened at the loss of hiking trails and their views, use of Wahl Lake, use of Marine Bay/Casey Cove, use of Delusion Bay either given over to or adversely affected by the development. I am saddened by the ever-increasing loss of access to waterfront and beaches by the residents of Prince Rupert and by tourists who now come to Dodge Cove and Digby Island for its natural values. 5 - social concerns: I am very saddened at the prospect of enormous, unwanted change in my very stable community. The effect of the stress surrounding this project is already being felt as people attempt to grapple with the immense amount we have had to learn and the enormous process of engaging, without much hope of a positive outcome. This stress is already causing schisms within the community, as personal tensions mount. Luckily, we have a long history together and are mostly able to subsume these splits. Some people have moved, some who would not otherwise do so are contemplating moving, and many are slowly or stopping improvements to their properties, in the light of the uncertainty (I am among those). Distrust and cynicism about government processes are at an all-time high. I worry about the effect of all the stress on my and my neighbours' health. The stress has been enormous, resulting in sleepless nights; out-of-control emotions like fear, anxiety and despair; and other psychological symptoms like having trouble formulating clear thoughts: I have experienced all of these since this process began. And no end in sight.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project, including for residents of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>1) Siting Concerns: With respect to safety and facility siting, Aurora LNG confirms that it intends to comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require a LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations. 2 Health Concerns: Various aspects of human health (defined as physiological health) were assessed in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and detailed in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application). The assessment concluded that the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically; 1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour, 24-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modeling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people). The levels of these criteria air contaminants are also below the air quality guidelines set by the World Health Organization. 2. Noise - The predicted levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels. Aurora LNG recognizes that many Dodge Cove residents have chosen to live a quiet rural lifestyle, and so they may be more sensitive to noise, even at levels that are below the applicable guidelines. Understanding this, Aurora LNG has included design changes to reduce predicted noise levels (e.g., revising the access road further away from Dodge Cove), and, continues to seek additional mitigation measures to reduce potential effects to Dodge Cove residents. 3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health. Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns of Dodge Cove residents regarding their local drinking water supply, and has proposed a revised access road right-of-way to avoid overlap between the access road and the watershed that drains into the Dodge Cove water supply. This would also place sections of the access road further from Dodge Cove. Aurora LNG has prepared a technical memo, "Dodge Cove Drinking Water Supply and Watershed", that provides more detail on the potential interactions and effects to the drinking water. This document will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1042 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>I am very mistrustful of the blandishments of the proponent concerning their wish for community engagement. This does not apply to Dodge Cove, which in my opinion, has everything to lose and nothing to gain. I am also mistrustful of provincial and federal governments that assure their citizens that a rigorous Environmental Review process is in place. The process seems to be set up to advantages proponents. Many lacunae, omissions, contradictions and poor science conducted with short time lines riddle the EA for Aurora. But the process proceeds apace, seemingly unstoppable. And, in the end, despite any conclusions the EAO comes to, the government can trump the findings with political decisions. In my opinion, "monitoring" is not acceptable mitigation.</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>3 Environment Concerns: Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns related to potential residual Project effects to vegetation communities and terrestrial and marine wildlife. Section 4.6.5 of the Application provides a discussion on changes to wetland habitats, and associated mitigations that Aurora LNG has committed to retain hydrological regimes and habitat function to wetlands within the LAA. Loss of some wetland habitat will be offset through the Wetland Compensation Plan described in Section 14.7. Section 4.7.5 of the Application discusses potential residual Project effects to terrestrial wildlife, including birds that use habitats on Digby Island and in Delusion Bay for foraging, staging during migration, breeding, and roosting. Delusion Bay is located outside of the PDA and the marine terminal, jetty, and berths are located east of the Bay. Migratory birds are not expected to adjust patterns in use of this region of Digby Island as a result of potential direct or indirect change in habitat from the Project. Potential residual Project effects to marine mammals, including harbour porpoise, were assessed in Section 4.10 of the Application. Mitigation to reduce the potential residual effects on marine mammals, including harbour porpoise, during construction activities will be developed as part of the Marine and Freshwater Resources Management Plan.</p> <p>4 Heritage Concerns: Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use) provides, among other considerations, an assessment of adverse effects on outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and vegetation and marine plant harvesting and gathering occurring on Digby Island. The assessment concludes that residual effects will be limited to the PDA with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>5 Social Concerns: Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area, changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated and a source of concern for local residents. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p>
1043 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Mark Boyce and Evelyn Merrill - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>RE: personal impacts of proposed Aurora LNG development</p> <p>Mark S Boyce &amp; Evelyn H. Merrill</p> <p>My wife, Evelyn Merrill, and I purchased a house in Dodge Cove in 2011 with the intent that we would retire there or at least spend much of our time there. We love the community, the fishing, the marine environment, and our tidy property. The proposed development of a work camp is less than 1 km west of our property (Lot 40) and we are concerned about the future noise, intrusions by individuals from the 5,000-person work camp, air and water pollution and a loss of the wonderful way of life in the community of Dodge Cove. Further, the proposed LNG development poses serious environmental risks to the productive Skeena Estuary that is so critical for salmonids during their migration to and from the Seekan River and tributaries.</p> <p>We oppose the LNG facility development in the proposed Digby Island location because of the risk to the environment and because it is highly likely that it will destroy our home in Dodge Cove.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potential adverse effects of the project (including those affecting Dodge Cove residents) and determine ways to avoid or lessen effects.</p> <p>Presence of Workers, Quality of Life/Community Identity and Social Cohesion</p> <p>The assessment of Community Health (Section 6.6 of the Application) indicates that with the implementation of mitigation measures (e.g., on-site security services, a worker code of conduct, worker orientation and a Community Engagement Plan) and through the use of a closed access camp (meaning that Project employees will be encouraged to remain onsite for the duration of their work shifts), effects related to the presence of workers on Digby Island, while high in magnitude during construction and decommissioning for the communities of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove (moderate during operations) are not significant. Section 13.5 of the Application considered issues not addressed in Part B of the Application including quality of life/community identity and social cohesion. Conclusions from the subsections 'quality of life/community identity' and 'social cohesion' are summarized below:</p> <p>1. Quality of life/community identity – Given the relatively small size of the community and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to the perceived quality of life and community identity for Dodge Cove residents (access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>2. Social cohesion - Social cohesion of Dodge Cove is connected to its sense of identity, community belonging and sense of security as a small and intimate 'rural marine' community. It is anticipated there will be certain changes to the nature and identity of Digby Island, and to the extent that social cohesion depends on this sense of identity, it will likewise change.</p> <p>Human Health – Air Quality, Noise, and Drinking Water</p> <p>The assessment of human health (Section 8.2 of the Application) and the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application) indicates that the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant.</p>
1043 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Mark Boyce and Evelyn Merrill - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people).</p> <p>2. Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</p> <p>3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</p> <p>Serious Harm to Fish</p> <p>The Fisheries Act and associated policy documents protects marine fish habitat through Section 35(2) of the Fisheries Act which prohibits serious harm to fish that are part of, or support, a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal (CRA) fishery. Aurora LNG will comply with all applicable regulations and legislation, and is committed to avoiding or mitigating serious harm to fish, and offsetting any residual serious harm to fish that results from the Project.</p> <p>Reference: Fisheries and Oceans Canada [DFO]. 2013. Fisheries Protection Policy Statement. Ecosystem Programs Policy. Ottawa, Ontario. 22 pp.</p>



1044	2017-03-07	Wendy Brooks - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Personal impact statement Wendy Brooks Dodge Cove</p> <p>The beginning of the impact that the Nexen/CNOOC Energy Aurora LNG proposal has had on me personally began in the autumn of 2014. Many residents of the community of Dodge Cove were awakened by the sound and sight of a helicopter cruising along the shore less than 100 m from our homes and less than 100 m above them. We asked, "what is going on?"</p> <p>There was a lot of helicopter traffic to follow but when I initially made phone calls to find out who was buzzing our community, I got nowhere. I then went to every helicopter operation in Prince Rupert and eventually found the company hired by Nexen. I spoke to a pilot about impact the noise was having on the community. His answer was, "well, get used to it! It's going to go on for a long time!"</p> <p>In spite of what the proponent considers a safe distance from our homes, the intrusion of noise (and visual impact) has echoed over our us for 2 1/2 years from dawn til dusk, 12 hours a day every day from early spring til late fall. I have observed a healthy Great Blue Heron colony less than 500 m from my house for over 15 years. They have lived near us with our occasional noise of equipment operating, or daily Medivac or a high flying sea plane passing over the community with no apparent concerns. In the summer of 2016, Nexen/CNOOC helicopters ran all spring constantly back and forth near their nests high in the trees of the rookery to the point that the adult herons abandoned their newly hatched chicks in their nests in June and did not return to them.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG proposal has impacted my life with continuous stress that has affected my well being. I am angry that neither the proponent nor the Provincial government had even considered including our quiet community in consultation before moving ahead with permits to proceed. A written response from our Provincial government told us the development was for the greater good of the province and that LNG would help China get off of coal. Meetings with the proponent left the community stunned that such a huge project was being considered in such close proximity to our homes and the information we were given often left us with more questions than answers. Each 'consultation' is only a passing of information of what is coming next - and it is never good news. A 3-lane highway and Hydro towers could be built within sight and sound of our homes. Maps from each Open House cover more of the island each time and intrude into our trails, beaches, watershed and over a huge wetland ecosystem. The habitat of every mammal, bird, amphibian and fish will be adversely affected.</p> <p>I have lived and worked in this region for forty years come this summer. I have lived in Dodge Cove, Digby island for nearly 32 years and worked in Prince Rupert until I retired in 2013. My partner and I raised 3 capable children who have very fond memories of growing up in this seaside community. I had looked forward to my retirement years and budgeted accordingly. More than half of the food we eat, we grow or harvest. Our air, soil, rain water and surroundings are clean, natural and unpolluted. The stress and anxiety I experience now, I also see in my neighbours. Some have developed chronic anxiety causing disturbed sleep patterns, family arguments, concerns for relationships, resentment or distrust of my neighbours, desperate comradery, extreme concern for our future ability to live in a damaged and poisoned environment, and the inability to find or afford another place to live anything like we have now. Very depressing.</p> <p>On a wider scale, I am concerned that the risk of a malfunction at the site or that the LNG tanker traffic could cause devastation to the region. It has happened with great cost and loss of life in other parts of the world. Does anyone else mistrust the longevity of things made in China?</p> <p>The Nexen/CNOOC Aurora LNG proposal, heavy industry causing pollution on a massive scale, should not be built on Digby Island, period.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Brooks</p>	<p>Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>With respect to social cohesion, Aurora LNG acknowledges that the community of Dodge Cove is connected to its sense of identity, community belonging and sense of security as a small and intimate 'rural marine' community. It is anticipated there will be certain changes to the nature and identity of Digby Island, and to the extent that social cohesion depends on this sense of identity, it will likewise change.</p> <p>Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application is provided in Section 13.5. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. Safety management systems, operating procedures, and risk assessments will be used to identify potential hazards and the safety measures required to protect facility personnel, equipment and the environment.</p>
1045 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	N. Carol Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Personal Impact:</p> <p>Dodge Cove is a community of over one hundred years situated on the east side of Digby Island. We contribute the founder of our community to George Dodge - a significant Canadian surveyor of the Northwest coast and the Alaska-BC International Boundary Line. George Dodge set up his surveyor's camp at Fairview Bay in 1910, which is directly across from Dodge Cove. In 1911, the Marine Station was built on the south side of Casey Cove as a means of protection for mariners and Canadians. In about 1911-12 with the expectation of immigrants and industry, a Hospital was built on Dodge Island locally known as Hospital Island. A compatible Dr.'s House was built on the south side of the cove and a bridge connected the two structures. By the 1920's many Norwegian settlers found this as a perfect place for their industry and their families. By the 1920's many Norwegian settlers found this as a perfect place for their industry and their families. Industry revolved around fishing, sawmilling and boatbuilding.</p> <p>Dodge Cove was also used as a place for recreation and the appreciation of its beaches and beauty. When the hospital fell into disuse very quickly, significant outdoor parties were held at the hospital. To this day Dodge or Hospital Island is a part of our existence as well as the trails and green spaces. There is the Casey Cove (Marine Bay) Beach Loop from our road along the beach to the Dr.'s House and either to the top of CBC Hill or past the Dr's House on the south side of the Cove back to the main road. The trails that begin in our community and extend out from it are all maintained on a volunteer basis. Trails that lead anywhere are a significant part of our unique existence on this island as they all have many uses. There are trails that lead to the ridge behind our properties that take us to the Dodge Cove dam, the ponds, Mt. Comblain and Wahl Lake. There are so many trails we have used for hunting, photography, wild food gathering, and recreation that it would be difficult to describe all of them. In the last ten years two tsunami trails have been built. One is mid Dodge Cove and one is at the north end of Dodge Cove. A trail leads northward to Crippen Cove, partially under the power lines that lead to the airport. There has been a very close connection between these two communities. A trail leads to Delusion Bay from one of the creeks on the south side of Casey Cove. Residents walk the beach to access the trail for hunting and recreation purposes. A Cabin there attests to the fact that it has had many visitors. There is a cabin near southwest beach as Spire Ledge is a famous fishing spot. Beaches there and on the west side are used for recreation and log beach combing and boats and kayaks use the whole island for circumnavigation. There are local businesses that rely on log salvaging, milling and fishing as well as boat building and photography. These will be negatively impacted by the plant in the heart of our island and from the jetties at the south end. Many mariners run out to Spire ledge and the south to fish or watch the whales in the winter. That will come to an end also. As a property owner, I will not want to hike to the back of my property and hike the ridge to Buddha Hill because there will be a camp from 1000 to 5000 of mostly men workers. I will not be going to bring my guests to see the view to the west. I will not be able to bring guests or family to see Spire rocks, to whale watch or to fish. My family will not be able to hike to Delusion Bay to birdwatch, hunt, or photograph. My guests and family will be cut off from Lake Wahl, named after a famous boatbuilder that lived and created an industry for his design of boats, living in Dodge Cove for most of his life.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Detailed information provided in the comment regarding the history of Dodge Cove as well as land and marine uses information for areas on and surrounding Digby Island supplements previously available information provided in Sections 6.4 Land and Resource Use and 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters. This information provides additional context for the assessment and strengthens Aurora LNG's understanding of baseline conditions.</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could potentially affect perceived levels of safety in the community of Dodge Cove. Assessed in Section 6.6 of the Application (Community Health), with the implementation of mitigation measures (e.g., on-site security services, a worker code of conduct, worker orientation and a Community Engagement Plan) and through the use of a closed access camp (meaning that Project employees will be encouraged to remain onsite for the duration of their work shifts), predicted effects related to the presence of workers on Digby Island, such as changes in privacy and security, should be mitigated. Section 13.5 (subsection 'Social Cohesion') addresses potential adverse changes on social cohesion due to the presence and activities of workers on Digby Island. It is understood that the behavior or perceptions of the community may change in response to the presence of a workcamp; however, a full range of mitigation measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes: The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce. Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community. Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community. Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime. Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic.</p> <p>Section 6.4 provides, among other considerations, an assessment of adverse effects on outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and vegetation and marine plant harvesting and gathering. Findings related to these non-tenured land uses are summarized below:</p> <p>Outdoor Recreation: Noted in Section 6.4 Land and Resource Use (subsection 6.4.5.3 Assessment of Change in Non-Tenured Land Use), residual effects will primarily occur within the project development area (PDA) where access will be restricted. Based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1045 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	N. Carol Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Aurora LNG will inform local communities within the LAA and identified stakeholders of the location and timing of Project activities, and other Project-related information (mitigation 6.4.6). The no disturbance zone (a 30 m riparian buffer and a larger buffer along the east side of Digby Island) will reduce adverse effects on access and use of the Frederick Point Trail (also referred to as the former World War Two road) as large portions of this trail will fall within this area. Because the camp is a closed-access camp (i.e., workers will remain within the confines of the PDA for the duration of their time at the Project site) with recreational opportunities provided onsite, potential effects from workers on recreational use due to increased demand will be reduced.</p> <p>Marine Recreation and Tourism: Noted in Section 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters (subsection 6.5.5.3 Assessment of Change in Marine Fisheries and Other Uses), recreational and tourism sites, including anchorages, coast campsites, marinas, and scuba diving areas are located throughout the LAA and RAA and most will not be affected by Project-related shipping, while many recreational boating routes hug the coast, with only limited overlap with Project shipping. While some sites or boating routes overlap the shipping route (e.g., near Triple Island and at the mouth of Prince Rupert harbour), safety and access to all recreation or tourism sites and routes will be maintained with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. For example, recreational and tourism operators will have access to real-time ship traffic information (e.g., from the MCTS) that can be used to anticipate vessel movements along the shipping route. Because shipping has occurred along the shipping route for decades, it is expected that eco-tour operators and recreational mariners will be accustomed to navigating around large vessel traffic, and in consideration of the proposed mitigation measures, the large vessel transits associated with the Project will not reduce access to the sites located along the shipping route.</p>
1046 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	N. Carol Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 2:</p> <p>At Frederick point are the remains of the Old Foret where even socials were held during the war. Again this was a significant spot for defense of our harbour. Where there should be safety for all those entering the harbour, for fisherman, tugboat operators, captains, ferries with tourists and all local people, instead there will be ground zero of a Hazard Zone which, due to a malfunction or leak, could take the lives of all people and animals within a 2.2 mile radius (Sandia National Laboratories). An old road runs from Frederick Point along the east side of Digby Island which was built during the war. Will I feel safe and secure for myself, my visitors or my family walking the beach to the Boy Scout Camp for berry picking or nettles? Of course not. Who would want to walk closer to the hazard in a hazard zone? Will I be allowed to hike the island, which is only approximately 10 km by 3.5 km, either south or west of Dodge Cove? Of course not. If this is not safe for me then it is not safe for others. That is why it is called a Hazard Zone. What really angers me is that Canada has not given any thought to the hazards that exist in letting the Chinese Government/Nationally Owned Oil Company buy a strategic inland wharf and the land (where the Marine Base was built) and that they have acquired by lease from the Provincial government an island that is most important for the protection and security of the Prince Rupert World Port and the Prince Rupert Airport. Obviously the importance of marine travel and air and marine ports for the protection of Canadians is at its lowest point.</p> <p>All the spaces in between these important places are just as important as the trails because without the health of the soil, the water and the air, then who would want to gather the food. It will be contaminated. If the fresh water habitat, the bog habitat and the fish habitat are sick then the health of the people will fail. The environmental application does not consider the sedimentation of our bog or streams from construction and how it will affect our drinking water, nor does it consider the acidification or eutrophication of our community water even though the changes due to green house gases will be significant. This LNG process will produce over 20% of BC's green house gases with upstream emissions. Of course Nexen-CNOOC has not put in their upstream emissions yet and they won't have to until much of the work on the application is finished. The application is a disguise for the truth as there are many missing parts that the public or working group has not seen yet.</p> <p>When I go to sacred places, such as Buddha Hill, the highest point on the island, where visitors leave offerings for their loved ones who have passed, and I look to the west, there will be no buffer zone and no visual quality left as Nexen claims. Before the Panoramic Pacific view there will be a workers camp with the noise and industry of the LNG trains and generators and the tree lane highway which will overlap our Official Community Plan. One reason the OCP is so important to call communities is to protect watersheds so communities have the right to life...water. We rely on the water just as it is --from the natural uncontaminated bog. The construction of the highway and all else related to Aurora LNG will irreversibly degenerate the quality of life on Digby Island.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>LNG is extremely safe. Factors contributing to the LNG industry's long-standing safety record include engineering design and construction of the LNG carrier cargo containment systems, equipment maintenance planning, industry standards, regulatory oversight, and personnel training in the context of applicable operational procedures. A detailed Emergency Response Plan and an Environmental Management Plan will be created, drawing on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as the partners' decades of global experience. As well, standard best management practices will be followed and we will implement a number of measures to prevent and mitigate accidents and malfunctions.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG plant will meet stringent regulations, standards and codes, and implement controlled ignition, gas leak detection, fire control and fire suppression technologies. Safety management systems, operating procedures, and risk assessments will be used to identify potential hazards and the safety measures required to protect facility personnel, equipment and the environment.</p> <p>Key safety-related equipment for emergency purposes will include shutdown and depressurization systems, fire protection, and safety flare systems (including flare stacks). A safety-instrumented system (including a combination of manual and automatic shutdown and gas depressurization processes) will be used at each LNG process train and the ship-loading facilities to manage the safety, shutdown and gas depressurization processes.</p> <p>Fire protection and safety measures (operating procedures and emergency response plans) will be used to protect personnel and equipment. Response equipment such as fire and gas detection systems, alarms, fire extinguishers, foam systems, firewater pumps, fire response vehicles, personal protective equipment, monitors, and passive protection will be provided onsite, at appropriate locations.</p> <p>In the more than 50 years since the first shipment of LNG to overseas markets, more than 33,000 LNG carrier voyages have covered more than 241 million kilometres (the equivalent of more than 6,000 trips around the earth) without incident (The International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers).</p> <p>Regarding effects on water quality and freshwater fish habitat, the Application considered the potential adverse effects on these components. Section 4.5 (Water Quality) assessed the effects of air emissions from the LNG facility during operations, and the potential for acidification or eutrophication of streams and lakes on Digby Island and surrounding areas. Section 4.8 (Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat) assessed potential effects of habitat change, including introduction of sediment into waterbodies during construction. Section 8 (Potential Effects to Human Health) assessed potential effects on drinking water. The application describes the mitigation measures that will be used and environmental standards that will be met to protect these water resources for protection of humans (drinking water) and for other aquatic life.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1046 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	N. Carol Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels.</p> <p>Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>Detailed information provided in the comment regarding the history of Digby Island as well as land use information for areas on Digby Island supplements previously available information provided in Section 6.4 Land and Resource Use. This information provides additional context for the assessment and strengthens Aurora LNG's understanding of baseline conditions.</p> <p>Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use) provides, among other considerations, an assessment of adverse effects on outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and vegetation and marine plant harvesting and gathering occurring on Digby Island. The assessment concludes that residual effects will be limited to the PDA with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p>

1047	2017-03-07	N. Carol Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 3: All the spaces in between all the trails holds our green space, our water, our air and all other living things which are embedded in the psyche of everyone who has ever lived on this island or visited it. Because of the beauty and the unique culture of the people, the island is a hotspot for artists and photographers. The Cove has had a few schools, three of which are still standing. The last school has been renovated to be the Community Centre. Many organizations work from the Centre. The old outdoor basketball court was has been used as a stage for musicians during the Dodge Cove Art Show. There is the Dodge Cove Arts Guild, the Digby Island Arts Group, The Coastal Quilters, and the Dodge Cove Recreation Society that depend upon the School for events and functions. The Recreation Society, the Dodge Cove Improvement District and the Dodge Cove Harbour Authority use the School's offices. The computers serve the public and mariners. The DC Authority maintains the dock and structures while the DCID maintains the Dodge Cove Dam and the Community Water.</p> <p>With the construction of Aurora, the beauty and sacred places will be gone, and with them the naturalists, artists and travellers who have come over the hundred years of our existence to reap not only the benefits of our backdoor wilderness but the commercial aspects also, whether it is the craftsman on the waterfront or the artisans who seek the history and wild places. All of it will be gone, because as go the fish, so go the fishermen, with the fishermen gone the boatsheds the builders/craftsmen will be gone. Our unique culture, of potlucks at the Schoolhouse, Santa Clause and Christmases, Winter Solstice celebrations at Casey Cove, Halloween costume parties, the Dodge Cove Art Shows and home cooked Easter Brunches where over one hundred visitors come to celebrate, not the event, but the location will dwindle or disappear. New Year Dances, Canada Day barbecues and First Fish Barbecues at Casey Cove North BEach will all be gone because this island will not be suitable to the health of populations. These events are all part of our diverse make up and tight knit community. It is my community and I have realized over the years how a community is built and how a community remains healthy. Part of my family's income will be affected as artists' interest in Dodge Cove dies as the beauty is destroyed. Many Dodge Cove citizens gain income from their art. As fishing and tourism decreases, and our population decreases on the island it will affect income from boat repairs that is part of income in my family also.</p> <p>The dredging and floating camp will ruin not only the fish and bird and beaches of Casey Cove but will ruin the wilderness and relatively quiet beach where residents and visitors go for stress free walks and where school children learn about beach habitat. The GHG emissions and methane have known carcinogens, the Hazard Zone has its own explosive dangers and anyone would have to think more than twice about raising children here. Why have the proponent, the provincial and federal governments allowed this aggressive invasion on a population? The safe and secure community with access only by the water will be gone as a complete abnormal town within a fence (a work camp), with one purpose, will be built behind us in our green space. I love the physical activity of walking, hiking, saking on Wahl Lake, outdoor barbecues, fishing, birdwatching, toad observations, gardening, messing about with boats and family life. I live here because the ocean is in front of me and the wilderness is behind as I know others in my community do. The voluneerism and cohesion of this very old style traditional way of life will pass by. This is a community with a very small footprint. We have no trucks and cars. We should be the model for everyone who cares about a better quality of life and a reduction of greenhouse gases. This island is my health but it is also a part of the health of Prince Rupert and its citizens.</p> <p>It this not more important for us to exist and live in a healthy lifestyle in a secure location, to show Canada that this traditional style community still has more relevance than a project of environmental destruction? In fact, shouldn't Canada depend on this "less is more way of life"? Didn't Canada make this commitment in Paris? LESS is a necessity. Aurora LNG and its output of up to 20% of BC's GHG emissions is the opposite, a commitment of more GHG's until 2050, long after the world's temperature has risen 1.5 degrees.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project, including for the Dodge Cove community, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Detailed information provided in the comment regarding sources of income, existing infrastructure and services, and cultural and social events, supplements previously available information provided in Section 5.2 Economic Conditions, 6.3 Infrastructure and Services and 6.6 Community Health. This information provides additional context for the assessment and strengthens Aurora LNG's understanding of baseline conditions.</p> <p>Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application is provided in Section 13.5. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living. These sections draw on case study analysis and conclude with statements regarding the status of these issues. The section focuses on Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove. For additional information on the floating camp, please refer to the technical memo entitled "Floating Camp Review" which will be filed with the BC EAO.</p>
1048	2017-03-07	Sarah Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of personal impact - Sarah Brown I have been having a very hard time coming up with a personal impact statement - as there is not one area of our lives that will NOT be impacted by this project. Of course, it is all due to the site location and proximity. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that this project will completely destroy the communities on Digby Island. Possibly someone might want to be here, but what type of person would that be? Any full-time residents? Seasonal - temporary - workers? Would any families ever wish to live here or move here again? When long term residents who have invested both financially and emotionally into living here are driven to move away (as has already started) what type of person would they be replaced with.</p> <p>This entire process has been a letdown from every angle, right from the start of how our community was kept in the dark, provided very little info either from the government or the proponent (eg. the deadlines on comment submission for the IUL was only one of many instances, to only being put on the working group at the end of the DAIR turning into the AIR so therefore had no influence on what aspects were being studied, to the more recent approval of funding for other communities while Dodge Cove was repeatedly told there was none - it seemed that every attempt was made to keep us uninformed and unaware). At a July meeting with Nexen, we were told that other communities had been sent info packages. We have yet to see what "info packages" were sent to other communities as we were not provided any.</p> <p>I really struggle with the fact that LNG terminals have been built around the world, and a few also did not follow SIGTTO guidelines: why is our government not studying the data from how those affected local residents? Yes, the oil and gas industry's mandate is to build these and they would like the negative impacts to look small, but it is our governments' job to protect our quality of life and I just don't see how only looking at proponent-purchased science is doing justice to the immensity of impacts that will be felt by this region. I really am angry at the case-by-case piecemeal approach of assessing these projects, when we should be looking at impacts elsewhere and using that available information.</p> <p>I am angry with our government making commitments and breaking them so repeatedly. We are repeatedly being inundated with scientific facts about climate change, and I am very concerned about the impacts that our governments actions are going to have, in my lifetime and my child's lifetime, and beyond.</p> <p>I have been struggling with stress, and health impacts from it, and seeing the effects change all our relationships in the community with each other, including within our own families, as we each try to deal with this crazy situation.</p> <p>This project is simply too close. I recently found a report on effects on flaring to people 1.3 km away, we will be closer, on that list of many health impacts that are awful is also Leukaemia. This has not even been mentioned that I am aware of, by either the proponent or the government, in discussions of impact to our community. The lack of information and available data, once again, is astounding.</p> <p>Impact to food gathering, hunting, fishing, gardening, sustainability, needs to be mentioned. As so many of us rely on the local seafood that impacts to the Skeena estuary will affect.</p> <p>I am floored by the lack of baseline studies - on LNG (serious gaps are missing in the studies that have been performed on how LNG plants act and react when an accident or malfunction happens), to baseline studies on impacts to communities, to baseline studies of the species in this region and the ecosystems here.</p> <p>Impact to present local economy, such as commercial fishing, tourism, boat building and repair, is a huge one. If these jobs are affected, people no longer will be able to live and work here. This community will lose the ability to function.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project, including those on the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>The proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, Aurora LNG consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." Aurora LNG has identified several location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>Adverse effects on forestry, commercial trapping, commercial fishing, and subsistence economic activities are assessed in Section 5.2.5.3 Characterization of Residual Effects for Change in Resource-based Primary and Subsistence Economies. With mitigation, adverse effects on forestry, commercial trapping, commercial fishing, and subsistence economic activities are not expected to be distinguishable from current conditions and trends and can be managed or mitigated through adjustments to programs, policies, or plans.</p> <p>Regarding effects on food gathering, hunting and fishing, Sections 6.4 Land and Resource Use, 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters and 6.6 Community Health collectively address changes in access and use of terrestrial (as well as freshwater) and marine-based areas and changes in the volume of harvested foods taken from these areas. These assessments draw on bio-physical assessments conducted in Section 4 of the Application (e.g., Section 4.6 Vegetation and Wetland Resources, Section 4.7 Wildlife Resources [Terrestrial] and 4.9 Marine Fish and Fish Habitat). Each of these sections present baseline information relative to local and regional assessment areas in sufficient detail to support the assessment of potential residual and cumulative effects.</p> <p>Section 9 assesses adverse effects related to accidents and malfunctions. Section 9.7 (LNG Plant Malfunctions) relates to flaring events. With the implementation of best practices, regulatory requirements and company standards, an accident and malfunctions scenario involving an LNG plant malfunction resulting in a flaring event will result in no significant effect to the valued components (i.e., air quality, GHGs, wildlife resources (terrestrial), marine birds, infrastructure and services, and human health).</p>

1049 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Sarah Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: As owners of property and of an independent small business, we fear losing our home and our ability to provide for our family at the same time. We also decry the loss of freedom of movement, not just within the OCP or trails, but across the island, and in the surrounding waters. The impacts to marine traffic in the inner harbour will also be anyone's guess, and water and waste is supposed to be hauled back and forth, including everything else, from the Marine Offloading Facility in Marine Bay, and one can only assume that some of that traffic will be transiting the inner harbour, plus any changes to traffic flow due to LNG tankers at the moth. What security impacts will there be, as people try to use the existing marine traffic areas? Concern for future generations that may have lived here just as we have, and the inability for our community to continue. This isn't just changing my present life but has had a direct negative impact on my family and child and will continue to do so. Our connection to this area and to our families' history in this area will be broken - we no longer will be able to do the same activities that we have always done. As we go through our daily routine, we are constantly in touch with our history and we have an awareness of our connection to both the past and the present, but pursuing traditional ways and work. While reading the community health section of the application, I was struck by all the ways community health is assessed. Many of these we don't even have in our community, so that is a fair indicator of the quality of life that we presently have. We don't suffer from problems with: -Crime -Human Economic Hardship -Health -Education -Children at Risk -Youth at Risk -Suicide Rates -Self-inflicted injuries -HIV and other STDs -Motor vehicle accidents -Stress -Social cohesion and conflict -Income I think we need a statement about how these measures do not even apply to our community, and a statement of what we see as measures of community health. Mat's simple statement is the best: community health is measured by "whether people are happy". For me, I thought of things such as: "can kids play safely on the beach at Marine Bay?" "Is it safe for my child to play in our yard, or walk down to visit her friends on her own, or ride her bike through the community?" "Do we know all our neighbours and stop and talk to them on the road/trail/dock, and do people help each other and watch out for each other?"</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project. Additional information on marine navigation is also available in the technical memorandums "Effects of Additional Project-related Traffic", "Navigational Sight Line and Glare Effects", and "Small Craft Assessment" which will be filed with the BC EAO. Measurable parameters used in the assessment of change in community health and wellness (Section 6.6) include occurrence-rates for medical and mental health incidents and change in select social determinants of health. As noted in the comment, some of the indicators used to describe baseline conditions related to these measurable parameters include crime, human economic hardship, stress and anxiety, sexually transmitted infections, motor vehicle injuries and deaths, suicide rates, and youth- and children-at-risk, among numerous others. Statistical baseline data on these indicators was taken from provincial and federal publications at the local health area and/or health service delivery area. Both administrative areas include the community of Dodge Cove. However, as noted in the comment, several of these indicators either do not directly apply to Dodge Cove. Aurora LNG recognizes that the community of Dodge Cove exhibits unique characteristics that are not necessarily shared with that the of the local or regional assessment areas (LAA and RAA) and that adverse effects could be disproportionately realized by residents of Dodge Cove. As such, the assessment of adverse residual and cumulative effects used a conservative approach that assumed potential adverse effects on the community of Dodge Cove would be higher in magnitude than on remaining LAA and RAA communities (where applicable). Therefore, Section 6.6 concludes that while potential project residual adverse and cumulative adverse effects on change in community health and wellness are assessed as not significant, adverse residual effects are expected to disproportionately affect vulnerable populations and residents of Dodge Cove and Crippen Cove. The measurable parameters suggested in the comment (through a series of questions) include; safety, social cohesion (e.g., community members know one another and can ask for help), access and enjoyment of the natural environment (both recreationally and for harvesting purposes), stress, out-migration, noise, privacy, changes in commercial business, demographics, in-migration, accommodations, and health. Together, these measurable parameters, as suggested in the comment, contribute to an overall measure of community health "whether people are healthy". Regarding these measurable parameters, all are included in either Section 6.6 (directly or indirectly through reference to other sections of the Application) or other supporting sections of the Application (e.g., Section 4.2 through 6.5 or Section 13.5). As such, additional consideration of these measurable parameters/indicators is not required.</p>
1049 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Sarah Brown - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>"Can we enjoy being outdoors, in our yard or on trails, can we hear natural sounds, the animals and birds, can we interact with the animals and birds, can we harvest our traditional foods where we traditionally harvest?" "Do we need to have stressful meetings all the time to deal with outside pressures and influences, or can we just enjoy interacting with our neighbours in a stress-free manner including social and spiritual gathering?" "Are long-term residents moving away?" "Can we sleep at night? What about the effects of stress and noise on sleep?" "Do we have privacy? Quiet? Access to traditional lands/waters that we have always had?" "Can small businesses operate as they have always done? Can families live as they have always done?" These are my measures of community health.</p>	
1050	2017-03-07	Sascha Gilbert - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I am a recent addition to the Dodge Cove community, but the effect the threat of the Aurora LNG project is having on the community is inescapable. It is the subject on everyone's mind and in many passing conversations, the stress and tension from it is palatable. There are some community members that are considering selling out and leaving before their properties become valueless. Dodge Cove is a unique place. I chose it as a place I wanted to live long term, buy property, perhaps raise a family. There are many environmental concerns around this proposed project, but forefront in my mind are the safety concerns regarding the 3.5 km hazard zone surrounding the site in case of a catastrophic explosion. The community of Dodge Cove sits well within that hazard zone (500 meters in some places) while the city of Prince Rupert and the Town of Port Edward are not far enough to escape unscathed should such an event occur. In 1997, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) published <i>Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties</i>. The document is clear and succinct in describing how to enhance LNG safety. -LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from a spill or release cannot affect civilians. -LNG shop berths must be far from the ship transit fairway to prevent collision, and since all other vessels must be considered an ignition source. -LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses now and into the future. -Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided, due to greater navigation risk. -Waterways containing navigation hazards are to be avoided as LNG ports. Prince Rupert and the surrounding area fails on every one of these points. I consider it highly irresponsible to plan a project of this nature so close to communities as well as the other industrial assets of the Port of Prince Rupert. I am the captain of a tugboat working from Prince Rupert and spend a significant majority of my time on the water, I can personally vouch for the navigation hazards and extreme and unpredictable weather conditions in the area. In conclusion, if this project is allowed to go through it will be a death sentence for a community that has stood more than 100 years and the end of a way of life for the people who live here.</p>	<p>With respect to safety and facility siting, Aurora LNG confirms that it intends to comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require a LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations. With respect to the SIGTTO, the document entitled Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In this regard, this guidance document does not identify exclusion zones, rather it focuses on identifying design considerations for jetty safety and presents a series of risk reduction options, which, in relation to jetty location, includes the recommendation that jetties be located away from populated areas and removed from other marine traffic and port activity. This SIGTTO guidance also promotes a flexible approach to jetty location that is focused on a localized determination based on the specific circumstances associated with the proposed facility and identifies measures (e.g. static and dynamic mooring analysis and the collection of site specific wind /wave data) that can be employed to reduce location risk. Nexen is of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance. Section 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters assesses changes in marine navigation (which includes consideration of safety). Noted in Section 6.5.5.2, All of the Project's in-water infrastructure is located outside of the main shipping route area and only 2% lies within the small vessel corridor. With Project infrastructure in place (including control zones), the width of the entire channel will be approximately 900 m wide at the narrowest part. By comparison, the entrance to the Burrard Inlet (Vancouver, BC) at First Narrows is approximately 450 m wide, while the Second Narrows is approximately 350 m wide, yet large and small vessels operate safely and efficiently. Docking LNG carriers will take approximately 30 minutes with the assistance of four tugs. The Prince Rupert Port Authority (PRPA) will continue to coordinate large vessel traffic so that turning will not affect other large vessels (i.e., the PRPA can request that other vessels modify their speed so as to avoid entering or exiting the port while a turning and docking process is underway). Finally, the existing and proposed traffic management and navigation, safety, and security procedures implemented by the PRPA, Pacific Pilotage Authority, Canadian Coast Guard, Transport Canada, and the RCMP will mitigate potential residual effects on marine navigation. Overall, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the Project will result in low magnitude residual effects on marine navigation. Additional information on marine navigation is also available in the technical memorandums "Effects of Additional Project-related Traffic", "Navigational Sight Line and Glare Effects", and "Small Craft Assessment" which will be filed with the BC EAO.</p>

1051	2017-03-07	Paul T Charette - Smithers, British Columbia	This project cannot be built without serious detrimental effects to humans,wildlife,and the environment of Digby Island and area. It will require a large gas pipeline across the province with it's own slew of environmental effects and it will be supplied with fracked gas from NE BC that should be left in the ground. I am totally opposed to this project because of it's effects on the environment.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1052	2017-03-07	Mathew Leakey - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Personal Impact</p> <p>Mathew Leakey, Property and small business co-owner, Dodge Cove, BC</p> <p>I can't believe that if everything we know about the adverse health effects and the environmental issues that come with a project of this kind, that our government is going to ignore international standards (SIGTTO guidelines) and put a project like this so close to my community. I was born here, grew up here and intended to raise my child here. But this project will destroy our way of life, with air pollution/water pollution / noise pollution.</p> <p>My concerns, as listed include: siting, environmental concerns, effects on human health and loss of heritage. My personal social concerns include economic considerations, loss of social cohesion in my community, loss of my way of life, the effects of stress and worry, feelings of cynicism and distrust, and fear for the future.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comments. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to; marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assessed in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and noted in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application), the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people).</li> <li>2. Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</li> <li>3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</li> </ol> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), potential changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated.</p> <p>However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p>
1053 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Karen McKinster - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Personal Impact</p> <p>I have lived in Dodge Cove full time since 1984, and on and off for a couple of years before buying property. There are so many things that are alarming about what have heard regarding Nexen's plan.</p> <p>The first is that it is setwavo close to our community... by anybody's measure.It seems that all standards have been ignored. It is all very well to that accidents are rare, but it would only take one to blow us all off the face of the earth. The docking facilities are to be situated at the mouth of Prince Rupert Harbour, and would severely restrict marine traffic. It is fairly narrow there anyway, and navigation would be difficult.</p> <p>Dodge Cove is situated directly downwind from the proposed facility, and no one seems to know or care much about the effects any emissions might have us, our water, or the wildlife. We enjoy quite a variety of birds, homesteaders and those passing through. WE eat salmon, halibut and crabs from the harbour. Our water system is threatened, our trail systems are threatened. We have for many years used Marine Bay for community get-togethers in summer and winter, and trekking up to Wahl Lake far skating is anticipated every winter. We all go beachcombing and many of us kayak and fish recreationally. And what about the close proximity to the airport? We have enjoyed a fairly unique way of life here in Dodge Cove. We are rural, but not far from town. What Will happen to property values here?</p> <p>This whole process has caused everybody untold stress. We all worry about our lifestyle, our water, the marine restrictions which are bound to come with this type of development. I worry about pollution — air, noise, water. Cynicism regarding government involvement in something that is potentially so damaging has led to distrust of those who are responsible for looking for our best interests.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment. The environmental assessment considered effects of the Project on air quality, on marine, freshwater, and terrestrial ecosystems, and on social and economic aspects of the human environment.</p> <p>Changes to freshwater habitats are addressed in section 4.7.5.3 and 4.7.6.4 of the Application. Aurora LNG has committed to monitoring freshwater systems to address the ecological responses of streams and lakes to acid and nitrogen deposition and, in turn, how such changes may affect wildlife health. This monitoring program is described in Section 15.2.2 of the Application.</p> <p>In terms of the assessment of human health, the Human Health section (Section 8.2 of the Application) and the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application) indicates that the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people).</li> <li>2. Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</li> <li>3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</li> </ol> <p>The application describes the mitigation measures that will be used and environmental standards that will be met to protect the environment and communities.</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated.</p> <p>However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1053 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Karen McKinster - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>Regarding property values, as noted in Section 13.5.3, it is difficult to predict how property values in the community of Dodge Cove may be affected. On the one hand, property values may be positively affected by a generalized increase in property values in the Prince Rupert area due to increased economic activity. On the other hand, locational factors associated with the siting of the Project near the community of Dodge could adversely affect property values. While research has shown that general economic factors can outweigh specific locational factors in regard to property valuations, in order to address potential adverse effects, Aurora LNG is committed to ongoing engagement with the Dodge Cove community, including discussions on addressing Project-related changes to property values.</p>
1054	2017-03-07	Francine Masse - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>These are some of my main concerns with the proposed Aurora LNG Development, in order of priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Environmental Concerns</li> <li>-Siting</li> <li>-Human health</li> <li>-Social Concerns</li> <li>-Heritage</li> </ul> <p>Digby Island should be kept intact for many reasons: It would be very sad to see all the environment be destroyed. It is a great place so close to town to be able to visit, where there is no industry, noise, destruction of environment. The people who live in Dodge Cove live there in harmony with the environment. Also, the people live there for where it is : far away from the noise, from the rush of the city and too many people. They have a very unique way of life that we should preserve. It is important to show others that there are alternative ways to live. Not everyone can and should live like most people with cars, stores close by, many people. It worries me to see that a plant can destroy the southern part of the island without any consideration for the people who live there. The lack of siting regulations that allow a plant so close to people can be very dangerous for the people who live there. I really hope you will consider all the reasons above for not building a LNG plant in the backyard of people.</p> <p>Francine Masse</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Regarding siting, Aurora LNG confirms that it intends to comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require a LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations.</p> <p>To help companies choose potential locations for a LNG port facility and manage potential risks, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), of which the project partners are members, published a list of "general considerations" in 1997. According to SIGTTO, these considerations were meant as "basic guides to prompt special inquiry into particular aspects" (SIGTTO Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, 1997). Aurora LNG used the SIGTTO recommendations when choosing Digby Island as the site of our proposed facility. Aurora LNG also followed separate guidelines established by the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC). In choosing Digby Island as the proposed Aurora LNG site, location-specific risks were identified, these risks will undergo further assessment to determine appropriate mitigation measures as part of the engineering design phase.</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels.</p> <p>Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. For information environmental, social, human health and heritage assessments refer to Sections 4, 6, 8 and 9 of the Application respectively.</p>
1055	2017-03-07	City of Prince Rupert - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Re: City of Prince Rupert Comment on Aurora LNG Application for Environmental Assessment Certificate</p> <p>The City of Prince Rupert is generally supportive of LNG development in the region, provided the proponent meets environmental standards identified in the CEAA and BCEAO processes and adequately addresses the socio-economic impacts of their project.</p> <p>Staff at the City Of Prince Rupert have reviewed the Aurora LNG Environmental Assessment Certificate Application and have several comments and requests for consideration by the BC Environmental Assessment Office as they perform their application review, assessment, and recommendations.</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>The information presented by the proponent in Section 4.02 and Appendix A Indicates that the proponent foresees no exceedances in the BC Air Quality Objectives (BCAQO) for air contaminants resulting solely from their activities. The proponent does however show that there is a strong likelihood of exceedances as a result of cumulative contributions from likely developments in the region. The proponent claims that no additional mitigation is required beyond what they propose because the expected exceedances to air quality occur in areas where receptors are not regularly present. The City Of Prince Rupert objects to these conclusions in two respects.</p> <p>In the first instance, the City is of the opinion that a more thorough explanation of the proponent's methodology is required before the figures they present can be accepted. The emissions predictions provided for the baseline and project-alone cases, when combined indicate the possibility for exceedances to the BCAQO for 1-hour NOx occurring in residential neighbourhoods of Prince Rupert. The proponent's application case however shows lower concentrations than expected for these areas, resulting in no exceedances for populated areas. If the proponent expects the public to have confidence in their predictions that residential air qualities will not be substantially affected, they must explain in further detail why their application case concentrations do not agree with what would be obtained through a combination of the project-only and baseline cases.</p>	<p>The City of Prince Rupert requests the the Proponent explain in further detail why their Application Case concentrations do not agree with what would be obtained through a summing of the Project-alone and Baseline cases.</p> <p>The predicted maxima in the Application Case do not equal the sum of the Base Case and Project-alone Case maxima because these maxima are not paired in time and space. Because the source configurations differ from case to case, the maxima in the Base Case does not occur at the same location and at the same time as the maxima in the Project-alone Case. Therefore the Application case maxima (which is the Base and Project-alone cases combined) is always less than the sum of the Base Case maxima and the Project-Alone Case maxima.</p> <p>All maximum predicted pollutant concentrations for all assessment cases at the community receptors were less than the BC Ambient Air Quality Objectives.</p>

1056	2017-03-07	City of Prince Rupert - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: Infrastructure</p> <p>In the application, the proponent acknowledges the significant infrastructure challenges already faced by the City of Prince Rupert. In particular, the proponent acknowledges the significant infrastructure costs which will be borne by the City in the event of project approval. These costs include but are not limited to an increased share of policing costs due to project-related population increases, the purchase of new fire suppression and rescue equipment at the Prince Rupert Airport due to increased passenger volumes, and road repair costs resulting from increased traffic volumes on a road network already in poor condition. The proponent is aware of the likelihood of these costs, but presents no firm mitigations to address them other than a commitment to prepare Transportation and Social Management Plans following the issuance of their Environmental Certificate. If the proponent is aware of their potential for direct contributions to these infrastructure costs, their mitigations should include a commitment to those costs which are directly attributable to their activities.</p> <p>In the supplemental Plume Rise Assessment, delivered many weeks after the application was received, the proponent acknowledges that their emergency boil off gas flare would create a plume which would impinge on the take-off and landing corridor for aircraft at the Prince Rupert Airport. Their proposed solution however is to relocate the flare eastward, where it would interfere with the South Corridor Visual Flight Rule. Neither of these scenarios is in the best interest of the Prince Rupert airport or local flight operators. The City therefore suggests that the proponent be required to examine alternative placements and configurations which would not have significant impacts on flight activity in these regularly used transportation corridors. The City further suggests that avoiding interference with all regular flight operations be required as a condition for approval of the application.</p> <p>The proponent states in their application summary that municipal government revenues during construction will total \$50 million, while annual property taxes paid to municipal government during operations are expected to total \$15 million per year. However these are not provided as a mitigation at any point during the application, nor are they attributed to any particular municipal government. Given that the proponent acknowledges that their project lies outside the Prince Rupert municipal boundaries, the proponent needs to further describe the mechanisms by which these revenues would be transferred to local municipalities, and to what degree these revenues would be expected to offset the proponent's directly attributable infrastructure costs.</p> <p>The City does not have confidence in the proponent's assessment of the likely effects of their project on housing demand in the Local Assessment Area. The proponent acknowledges in their baseline conditions assessment that Prince Rupert has low vacancy rates (most recently estimated at 37%), and that the approval of their project would likely lead to significant in-migration to the city. The proponent also acknowledges the City's estimates that approximately 300 affordable housing units are required to offset demand associated with the construction of LNG projects in the region, and that increased wages in the Local Assessment Area as a result of project employment would be likely to have significant impacts on the affordability of housing in the region. Despite this, the proponent suggests only two mitigations (construction of worker accommodations and future engagement activities), neither of which address the directly attributable impacts on housing affordability as a result of project construction.</p> <p>The City therefore strongly suggests that the proponent make firm commitments for the mitigation of housing effects attributable to their approval. This includes commitments to build affordable housing for those displaced by increased prices and lower availability in the housing market, as well as providing financial support for local organizations providing housing and support services to homeless and displaced people. The effects of this project on local housing availability and affordability when measured against baseline figures must be either neutral or positive at all stages of the project to be in the community's best interests.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project. As stated in Section 6.3.6.2 of the Application, the Project falls outside the municipality of Prince Rupert and changes in the municipal tax base will be primarily related to in-migrating populations to the City of Prince Rupert. However, through tax revenue sharing (a Provincial Government authorized formal tax sharing agreement established through adjustments in municipal letters patent or through legislation) with the North Coast Regional District, the City of Prince Rupert could realize increased tax revenue from the Project itself. Noted in the 2015 KPMG report, 'Sale of Services' (e.g., utilities, transportation etc.) and 'Residential Tax' revenues accounted for the two largest revenue sources for the City of Prince Rupert in 2013. Project-related in-migration will increase these revenues and funds available to offset incremental demand associated with the Project.</p> <p>In addition to Project-related population effects, in-migration associated with other projects and physical activities considered in the cumulative case (see Table 6.3-28) will also increase 'Sale of Service' and 'Residential Tax' revenue. Those projects and physical activities that occur within the municipal boundaries of the City of Prince Rupert will also increase commercial or industrial tax bases. 'Payment in Lieu of Tax' (payments based on the principles of equity and relative impact on local Governments), as is the case of the Port, could also be beneficially affected through the development of projects considered in the cumulative case. While it is recognized that short-term adverse effects could occur regarding funding for demand for services, over the long-term, continued economic development and increases in resident, commercial and industrial tax bases, as enhanced through adjustments in municipal and regional government plans and policies, effects are expected to be beneficial.</p> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that LAA accommodations have limited capacity to absorb increased demand in the short-term and that Project-related in-migration has the potential to increase demand. While specific mitigation measures to develop social housing and provide financial support for local organizations to provide housing and support services to homeless and displaced persons is not proposed, Aurora LNG believes that through the use of a closed-access camp (meaning that Project employees will be encouraged to remain onsite), anticipated implantation of a logistics policy that requires fly-in/fly-out (FIFO) workers to be transported to and from the Project and their point of hire (i.e., home communities), and mitigation measures proposed in Table 6.3-22, that adverse effects associated with housing demand will be reduced.</p>
1057	2017-03-07	City of Prince Rupert - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Part 3: Economy</p> <p>While the addition of new industry to the local area is welcomed by the City, the economic benefits achieved from this project must not come at the expense of local businesses and residents. The proponent acknowledges that the wages paid to project workers will be significantly higher than those offered by existing businesses, and will likely place many businesses under wage pressure. The proponent's suggestion that this local employment in the project will draw only from those currently unemployed, and not draw valuable employees away from existing businesses appears to be speculative, and likely underestimates the project's negative impacts on local employers. The proponent also proposes to house its workers at a closed camp outside of Prince Rupert as a means of mitigating against a number of other concerns, but the effect of this is that the bulk of spending resulting from project employment during construction will take place outside of the community.</p> <p>These factors are likely to combine to exacerbate already challenging staffing conditions for local retail, dining, and service businesses. Especially in a cumulative effects scenario, where the city is exposed to prolonged and overlapping construction activities from multiple projects, the risk is high that many local businesses will experience losses, or be forced to close. The proponent's only suggested mitigations are insufficient in the City's view to address these concerns, and have the potential to result in long-term negative impacts to the economic diversity of the City. Given this, the City recommends that the proponent be required to measure their effect on the local business environment during construction, and commit to re-investing in local businesses over the course of operations to counteract any negative effects from economic shock.</p> <p>Community Health</p> <p>In section 6.06 of the application, the proponent lists in great detail the quantifiable baseline measures of community health, including income inequality, person life years lost due to various factors, child poverty, healthy diets, alcohol use, mental health statistics, and more. As well, the proponent notes in many areas how the local area suffers from poor performance on many of these measures. However the proponent's proposed mitigations for negative effects on these determinants of health as a result of their project are limited exclusively to protecting the health of those employed by the project. For a major industrial project to be granted the social licence to operate in a community, they must commit to at the very least maintaining if not improving the community's health and wellbeing. The City strongly suggests that the proponent be required to measure and monitor the baseline measures of health they've identified prior to construction start, and commit to maintain or improve these measures over the lifetime of their operations. We appreciate your consideration of our comments.</p> <p>Thank you, Mayor Lee Brain</p>	<p>Economic Monitoring: Aurora LNG has proposed to prepare a social management plan (SMP). SMP elements will include monitoring the effectiveness of mitigation measures as well as adaptive management. Aurora LNG looks forward to working with the City of Prince Rupert to identify appropriate monitoring indicators for inclusion within the SMP, which may include indicators related to the local business environment. During project operations, Aurora LNG anticipates that its effects on the economic environment will stabilize and be primarily beneficial to Prince Rupert, both from direct Project spending, as well as from the large number of well-paying operational jobs that the Project will bring to the community.</p> <p>Community Health; Mitigation Measures 6.3.1 (SMP) requires Aurora LNG to engage with concerned stakeholders, Working Group members (e.g., Northern Health) and Aboriginal Groups to develop metrics used to monitor changes in demand on infrastructure and services (e.g., health care infrastructure and services). On-going monitoring of changes in health status is completed at the federal and provincial level. Federally, Health Canada, Statistics Canada and the Canadian Institute for Health Information monitor and report on various measures of health status. Provincially, BC Stats, the Provincial Health Services Authority, Local Health Authorities (e.g., Northern Health) and the Aboriginal Health Authority monitor and report on various measures of health status.</p>

1058 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Laura Moore - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Internal use: note that this is the same letter as Lou Allison, but with a different name attributed by EAO.</p> <p>Statement of Public Impact Re: the Proposed Aurora LNG Development</p> <p>Lou Allison - property owner, small business owner, resident of Dodge Cove</p> <p>In a lengthy public comment, I have listed some of my concerns with both the Environmental Assessment process and the Proposed Aurora LNG Project. In this statement, I would like to address some of the personal issues that have arisen in the ensuing of this project:</p> <p>1 - concerns about siting: I feel that this enormous project is much too close to our community of Dodge Cove, and that the Province, in its refusal to enact properly considered siting guidelines, is allowing corporate interests, rather than the protection and welfare of its citizens, dictate its agenda. This is an enormous betrayal. Also, siting the plant at the restricted mouth of a busy Port is sheer folly. The increase in large and small vessel traffic as other sectors of the economy continue to develop (cruise ships, ferries, container-carrying freighters, bulk freight carriers, log ships, pellet-carrying ships, fishing vessel, recreational boaters, canoers, kayakers, on and on...). My husband and I frequently go out into Chatham Sound in one of our small boats, fishing, beach-combing, whale-watching, touring visitors, and visiting relatives who live on Porcher Island: what is that going to be like with the huge jetty and security perimeters around the LNG loading?</p> <p>2 - concerns about health impacts: I am worried about the effect of emissions on air and water quality; also the effect of noise pollution as we are already suffering in Dodge Cove from a large increase in noise from the Container Port (which is expanding exponentially) and Pellet-Loading Facility (ditto). The constant helicopter noise resulting from the proponent's work under their License for Investigative Use was extremely onerous, and bodes poorly for the future. We are dreading its resumption, after a hiatus for the winter.</p> <p>3 - concerns about the environment: as an organic gardener with a property listed with the Canadian Wildlife Federation, and an avid naturalist, I am very concerned about the local wildlife, marine and terrestrial, from polluting insects to whales. I am very concerned about the loss of a large and important part of Digby Island, with its fragile bogs, and Delusion Bay, an important stop for migrating birds and important habitat for harbour porpoises, which are relatively abundant in the area and localized in their habits. Losing these important close-to-home habitats and species is heart-breaking.</p> <p>4 - concerns about heritage: I am saddened at the loss of hiking trails and their views, use of Wahl Lake, use of Marine Bay/Casey Cove, use of Delusion Bay either given over to or adversely affected by the development. I am saddened by the ever-increasing loss of access to waterfront and beaches by the residents of Prince Rupert and by tourists who now come to Dodge Cove and Digby Island for its natural values.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project, including for residents of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>1) Siting Concerns: With respect to safety and facility siting, Aurora LNG confirms that it intends to comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require a LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations.</p> <p>2 Health Concerns: Various aspects of human health (defined as physiological health) were assessed in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and detailed in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application). The assessment concluded that the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically;</p> <p>1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour, 24-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modeling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people). The levels of these criteria air contaminants are also below the air quality guidelines set by the World Health Organization.</p> <p>2. Noise - The predicted levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels. Aurora LNG recognizes that many Dodge Cove residents have chosen to live a quiet rural lifestyle, and so they may be more sensitive to noise, even at levels that are below the applicable guidelines. Understanding this, Aurora LNG has included design changes to reduce predicted noise levels (e.g., revising the access road further away from Dodge Cove), and, continues to seek additional mitigation measures to reduce potential effects to Dodge Cove residents.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1058 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Laura Moore - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>5 - social concerns: I am very saddened at the prospect of enormous, unwanted change in my very stable community. The effect of the stress surrounding this project is already being felt as people attempt to grapple with the immense amount we have had to learn and the enormous process of engaging, without much hope of a positive outcome. This stress is already causing schisms within the community, as personal tensions mount. Luckily, we have a long history together and are mostly able to subsume these splits. Some people have moved, some who would not otherwise do so are contemplating moving, and many are slowly or stopping improvements to their properties, in the light of the uncertainty (I am among those). Distrust and cynicism about government processes are at an all-time high. I worry about the effect of all the stress on my and my neighbours' health. The stress has been enormous, resulting in sleepless nights; out-of-control emotions like fear, anxiety and despair; and other psychological symptoms like having trouble formulating clear thoughts: I have experienced all of these since this process began. And no end in sight.</p> <p>I am very mistrustful of the blandishments of the proponent concerning their wish for community engagement. This does not apply to Dodge Cove, which in my opinion, has everything to lose and nothing to gain. I am also mistrustful of provincial and federal governments that assure their citizens that a rigorous Environmental Review process is in place. The process seems to be set up to advantages proponents. Many lacunae, omissions, contradictions and poor science conducted with short time lines riddle the EA for Aurora. But the process proceeds apace, seemingly unstoppable. And, in the end, despite any conclusions the EAO comes to, the government can trump the findings with political decisions. In my opinion, "monitoring" is not acceptable mitigation.</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health. Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns of Dodge Cove residents regarding their local drinking water supply, and has proposed a revised access road right-of-way to avoid overlap between the access road and the watershed that drains into the Dodge Cove water supply. This would also place sections of the access road further from Dodge Cove.</p> <p>Aurora LNG has prepared a technical memo, "Dodge Cove Drinking Water Supply and Watershed", that provides more detail on the potential interactions and effects to the drinking water. This document will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>3 Environment Concerns: Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns related to potential residual Project effects to vegetation communities and terrestrial and marine wildlife. Section 4.6.5 of the Application provides a discussion on changes to wetland habitats, and associated mitigations that Aurora LNG has committed to retain hydrological regimes and habitat function to wetlands within the LAA. Loss of some wetland habitat will be offset through the Wetland Compensation Plan described in Section 14.7. Section 4.7.5 of the Application discusses potential residual Project effects to terrestrial wildlife, including birds that use habitats on Digby Island and in Delusion Bay for foraging, staging during migration, breeding, and roosting.</p> <p>Delusion Bay is located outside of the PDA and the marine terminal, jetty, and berths are located east of the Bay. Migratory birds are not expected to adjust patterns in use of this region of Digby Island as a result of potential direct or indirect change in habitat from the Project.</p> <p>Potential residual Project effects to marine mammals, including harbour porpoise, were assessed in Section 4.10 of the Application. Mitigation to reduce the potential residual effects on marine mammals, including harbour porpoise, during construction activities will be developed as part of the Marine and Freshwater Resources Management Plan.</p> <p>4 Heritage Concerns: Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use) provides, among other considerations, an assessment of adverse effects on outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and vegetation and marine plant harvesting and gathering occurring on Digby Island. The assessment concludes that residual effects will be limited to the PDA with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>5 Social Concerns: Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area, changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated and a source of concern for local residents. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p>



1059 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Des Nobels - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>Statement of Personal Impact</b> My name is Modestus Martinus Nobels, have lived on the north coast of British Columbia for 43 years. For the last 32 years have lived in Dodge Cove on Digby Island and along with my partner, we raised our three children and made a life for ourselves here. My community is a very unique place, one of only a few water access only communities on the BC coast and for the last one hundred years it has had a strong relationship With the land and sea that surround it. The community has a long maritime history, many vessels for the BC fishery were built in the community and many from the community, such as myself, have made their livings as fishermen or shore workers. My neighbours are strong capable individuals able to thrive in what many consider a harsh environment and they all treasure this place. Nexen- CNOOC has portrayed our community as a "Vulnerable non resilient population". I am offended by such comments and believe they are meant to denigrate our community's value and the historic relationship we have with this place. My community is extremely resilient and our time here speaks to that ability, but what community can stand when the ties and relationships between resources and community are destroyed by government policies. Should the Nexen-CNOOC, Aurora LNG project proceed on the south end of Digby Island, the impacts to myself and the community of Dodge Cove will be profound and all encompassing. Every aspect of our lives will be impacted, from the quality of our air, water and soil to the foods we harvest and grow. Over the past two years Nexen has conducted exploratory work adjacent to our homes and the constant helicopter noise has affected wild life and residents alike; some of both have chosen to leave. With the imposition of this project our community has had to scramble to stay informed and engaged .We were the last to be informed, my community was an afterthought on the part of the government of BC and Nexen, had we not insisted, no one would have acknowledged our existence and we continue to have to remain vigilant. The constant task of engaging on numerous fronts, Assessment process, several levels of government, proponents and the community is taking its toll on myself and my neighbours. Siting- This is the most troubling aspect of the Aurora LNG project, because it will be only half a kilometer from our community, The province did not do its due diligence when it provided the land on Digby to Nexen or it just chose to ignore the people that live here. We will be the first to feel the effects to our health and well being. The provincial government promised we would be world leading, using best practices. This project is neither and in my opinion it will have significant impacts on me, my family, neighbours and surrounding communities because of its siting. It should not receive an environmental certificate. Human Health- The Aurora LNG project Will dump thousands of tons of harmful emissions on myself and my community every year and despite the assurances from Nexen that there will be no significant impacts to our health, common sense tells me otherwise. The EA only takes into account physical health, a very narrow and antiquated view. In the real world of health science it has been accepted for many years that mental health and well being are significant determinates of overall health. The Prince Rupert Airshed Study conducted by the provincial MOE indicates high concentrations of pollutants over Dodge Cove and only confirms my own beliefs, that Nexen is not being truthful nor does it care about my community. Based on my own observations and despite Nexen's mantra of "there will be no significant impacts" this project will have major impacts to our health over time and we will live with the chronic pollution of our environment. In my opinion the Nexen-CNOOC, Aurora LNG project is having significant impacts on our health already and this will only escalate as the project moves forward. Aurora LNG should not be granted an EA certificate.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by this comment and is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with the community to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the Project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the Project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones. Section 6.6 (Community Health) uses the WHO's definition of health (a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity) in the assessment of change in community health and wellness. This assessment considers physical and mental health as well as social determinants of health (e.g., social environments, social support networks, and income and social status). Concluded in Section 6.6, while effects on community health and wellness are not significant, adverse effects will be disproportionately realized by residents of Dodge Cove due to the proximity of the Project. With respect to the assessment of Human Health (Section 8.2 of the Application), potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically: 1. Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people). 2. Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1059 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Des Nobels - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p><b>Social Concerns-</b> The stresses of coming to grips with this complex project has already had impacts on the social fabric of my community as individuals and families contemplate their futures. I, like my neighbours, ride a rollercoaster of emotions when confronting the arrogance of those who chose to ignore and then bully us. Things have changed in my community over the last two years, spontaneous gatherings have become less frequent, conversations more guarded as the specter of Nexen continues to darken our door. This community is made up of long term residents, generational families, and this has always been a strength. It has been a great place to raise children and those who have grown up here are of the highest caliber, good people. I fear the loss of this place to future generations, as it was my hope to have my grandchildren here to enjoy the beauty of this place. The thought of this project proceeding brings a great sadness to me and leaves me hollow as I consider the loss of long term relationships with my neighbours, the land and the waters. Despite Nexen's assumptions and assertions that their project will have no significant impacts on our social well being, I know that it is already having profound impacts and these will increase with time. Aurora LNG should not be granted an EA certificate. <b>Environmental Concerns-</b> Nexen plans to scrape clean, blast flat the southern end of the island and with a 5000 man work camp, build the largest LNG facility in BC right next door to us and our airport, belching tons of pollutants on us and assaulting our senses with intense light and noise. Nexen states that there will not be any significant impacts to the environment and over time all will be well. I am of the opinion that Nexen is not being honest and should not be granted an EA certificate. <b>Heritage-</b> The loss of access to the land and water resources of our island that this project presents is disturbing to me. These assets have always been a part of our community's lives and they are priceless. When I stand on our beach and look to where Aurora will stand I'm appalled at the scale of the destruction being contemplated. This Island is our shared heritage and what is being proposed will forever alter the landscape, robbing generations to come - for a 25 year promise? I, my neighbours and the community of Dodge Cove have been held hostage for last two years by Nexen, the province and the process. We want our lives back.</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>3. Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p>
1060	2017-03-07	Dave Prosser - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>Statement of Personal Impact</b> I first came to Dodge Cove in 1977 to work in a local boatyard that was building 40-50 foot wooden trollers. Dodge Cove has had a long history of boat building and commercial fishing and the development of a life style that reflected its location and character. It is an example of a community that was once common on this coast and provided an ideal support system for raising a family and pursuing a career of commercial fishing and boat repair business. We are completely surrounded by near unspoiled nature, We are on a fl»vayfor a great variety of migrating birds and surrounded by one of the most fertile maritime systems in the world.. The community makes full use of the bounty that surrounds us. Marine Bay (Casey Cove) is a focal point of many community activities. Wahl Lake has provided abundant opportunities for winter sports. We harvest seafood from the surrounding waters. The proposed Aurora LNG plant on the land which surrounds us has a potentially devastating impact on a lifestyle we have enjoyed for nearly 100 years. It appears that in the mad rush to fulfill an election promise many of the safeguards we felt were in place to protect our right to clean air. water and social values have been brushed aside. Nowhere else in the world have such developments be allowed in such close proximity and downwind of a long established community. There appear to be no standards regulating this siting, its impact on marine and air traffic or the result of worse case scenarios resulting from potential accidents, both human error or natural disasters such as earthquakes. The lack of respect displayed on the siting of this project has created an air of cynicism and distrust of a system that that we have naively taken for granted. There many more appropriate locations for such industrial developments, but with much less social and environmental impact. Why must it be directly in the air and water sheds of the majority of the residents on the North Coast?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Section 4.7 provides baseline information on non-marine birds (those that use terrestrial habitats) while Section 4.10 Marine Wildlife provides baseline information on marine birds. Section 4.7 assesses changes in habitat, mortality risk and movement and Section 4.10 assesses changes in habitat, behaviour and mortality risk. Section 6.4 Land and Resource Use provides a description of existing conditions related to non-tenured land use (e.g., activities at Wahl Lake, and marine plant and vegetation gathering) and assesses changes in access and use of these areas. Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application is provided in Section 13.5, focusing on Dodge cove and Crippen Cove. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living. These sections draw on case study analysis.</p>

1061	2017-03-07	Mila Puharich - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>From: Mila Puharich This is my personal impact statement I have a personal social Concern about the proposed Aurora Nexen-Inpex LNG plant for Digby Island. I have recently moved to Prince Rupert with my partner so he can continue advancing in his chosen career, in the marine industry. We have found a wonderful place to live and a great community join in Dodge Cove on Digby Island. The landlords told us, "if you want to buy the place you have to live here a year, through all the seasons and then we'll talk about selling." They want to make sure we are the right people to add to the Cove and I feel that is fair. The community is rich with historical knowledge and interesting old coots. There is a security in knowing your neighbours and helping shape the neighbourhood. My partner and I want to start a family. Dodge Cove might be the place for us. But not if the Aurora LNG plant is built in my backyard. I want to have multiple gardens, a workshop and goats. This will not happen if the Aurora LNG plant is built in my backyard. I will not put roots down in Prince Rupert or any of the outlying communities if Aurora LNG plant is built on Digby Island. I am a boilermaker fitter welder for income, that jobs entails a work away schedule. For many months out of a year I am away from my home and family. I bring home a lot of money and want to use it to grown and support the place that I live. That will not happen if the Aurora LNG plant is built in my backyard. When I am home, I stay home. I want to step away from industry noise, pollution and destruction when I am home. I don't want to find dead animals and destroyed habitats on my days off. I want a place of peace, that I can nurture a family. Those things will not happen if the Aurora LNG plant is built in my backyard. I have heard so many logical and factual reasons Why the Aurora LNG plant cannot be build on Digby Island. From habitat destruction, to air and water pollution, to why tankers cannot be used safely in the proposed waters, to legitimate concerns over explosions and the overaxation Of emergency services when a disaster happens; that I am boggled why I have to fight anyone on this. My vote should count and my vote is no.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project, including on the Dodge Cove community, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects. Baseline information and effect assessments for bio-physical valued components (i.e., Air Quality, Greenhouses Gases, Acoustic Environment, Water Quality, Vegetation and Wetland Resources, Wildlife Resources [Terrestrial], Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat, and Marine Wildlife) are provided in Sections 4.2 through 4.10, respectively. Baseline information and effect assessment for economic and social valued components (i.e., Economic Conditions, Visual Quality, Infrastructure and Services, Land and Resource Use, Marine Use and Navigable Waters, and Community Health) are provided in Sections 5.2 and 6.2 through 6.6 respectively. Adverse effects resulting from accidents and malfunctions are presented in Section 9.0. Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful, and mutually beneficial relationships with local communities such as residents of Dodge Cove.</p>
1062	2017-03-07	Jeremiah Randall - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Public Impact Re: the Proposed Aurora LNG Development Jeremiah Randall- property owner, small business owner, resident of Dodge Cove My biggest concern is that the promise of prosperity through LNG is an economic lie that won't help BC or Canada. I don't believe that Canada will receive just return for the value of the resource. I think that we are giving it away with both hands. What we are causing with the construction of the Aurora LNG plant is tremendous destruction of the environment of Digby Island and the beautiful area of Delusion Bay. In my opinion, the project will cause enormous Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Fracking to Freeze. I am also worried about the emissions once the plant is constructed: the flaring and other emissions that will come over our community, not only our air but also our water. Furthermore, I feel tremendous stress and anger that Our government is being so influenced by corporate interests. I don't trust that the government has the people's best interests at heart. I will forever be worried about the possibility of a catastrophic accident, and fear that, if this project goes ahead, I will have to move away from the home I have made here.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concern raised by the comment. The following sections of the Aurora LNG's Application address the various issues and concerns identified in the comment; Section 1.4 - economic benefits of the project; Section 4.3 - Greenhouse gas emissions, and supplemental memo on upstream GHG emissions; Sections 4.6 and 4.7 - environmental effects on vegetation and wildlife; Section 6.2 - Visual Quality and Supplemental memo illustrating the potential visual effects of flaring; Section 6.4 - Land and Resource Use; Section 9.0 - Accidents or Malfunctions, within which "Fire and Explosions" is addressed in Section 9.6; Section 13.5 - Concerns Not Identified in Part B of Application</p>
1063	2017-03-07	Sarah Ridgway - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Statement of Personal Impact What about Property Values? Who would want to buy a place beside an LNG plant? For many in Dodge Cove, this is where they have invested. Where they have built their homes. Where they have or plan to raise their families. Several families have lived in Dodge Cove for generations and could never imagine something like this happening to their home. Myself and many others love to hike and explore the island. My 14yr old son hiked the entire bottom end of Digby this last summer- he had a helicopter hover above him! And I have fa riend who went to the scout camp on the East side Of the island and was asked to leave because a helicopter was going to land there. This LNG development is making things uncomfortable for us , things that were normally a way of life for us. Who really wants to hike around with helicopters following them around? I know several Dodge Cove residents that harvest nettles, berries, mushrooms on our island. So may I ask is our picking of mushrooms, berries and nettles going to be prevented? Or is it going to be polluted by the development? I know our crab fishing spots will be, as well as several of our camping and kayaking spots. I am aware that roads take a lot of rock and compacting so how is our ground surface supply of water going to get to us? Is LNG going to provide Dodge Cove With potable water? There is a map that shows a fresh-water line running from Kaien Island to Casey Cove. I feel it is the least they could do. We have invested in Dodge Cove and support several of the business that in this amazing community. And one day we plan to build a home in Dodge Cove.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could potentially affect the ;community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones. Outstanding community concerns regarding changes to perceived quality of life may continue, despite the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. Regarding property values, as noted in Section 13.5.3 of the Application, it is difficult to predict how property values in the community of Dodge Cove may be affected. On the one hand, property values may be positively affected by a generalized increase in property values in the Prince Rupert area due to increased economic activity; on the other hand, locational factors associated with the siting of the Project near the community of Dodge could adversely affect property values. While research has shown that general economic factors can outweigh specific locational factors in regard to property valuations, in order to address potential adverse effects Aurora LNG is committed to ongoing engagement with the Dodge Cove community, including discussions on addressing Project-related changes to property values. Aurora LNG acknowledges that the harvesting of nettles, berries, mushrooms and other vegetation may be affected within the project development area. However, no restrictions or limitations to prevent harvesting is expected outside of this area. The quality of food harvested on land would not be affected by the Project as there would be no solid or liquid discharges to lands outside of the project development area. Aurora LNG has acknowledged the concerns raised by Dodge Cove residents regarding the potential effects to drinking water sourced from the Dodge Cove reservoir. In response to these concerns, Aurora LNG has revised the proposed access road further to the west so that it does not overlap with the watershed that drains into the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir. An elevated ridge and additional vegetation lies between the revised access road route and Dodge Cove, which would aid in mitigating noise for the community.</p>

1064	2017-03-07	Bill Smith - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Attn: EAO</p> <p>Personal impact statement re Aurora LNG Digby Island project:</p> <p>As a commercial salmon fisherman I am concerned about the impact an LNG terminal on Digby Island will have on my livelihood. The proposed location of the LNG docking facility near Delusion Bay, on the southeast corner of Digby Island, is in the Skeena River estuary and is an important holding area for salmon fry. Construction of the dock and increased ship activity in this area could seriously affect Skeena River salmon survival. I also worry about the reduction of traditional gillnetting areas on the outside of Digby Island and in Chatham Sound due to exclusion zones around the project and LNG tankers.</p> <p>For forty years I've been fishing on the North Coast - long lining, trolling and gillnetting. Now, primarily because of reallocations and license restrictions, I only gillnet. Still, fishing provides me with a modest income, nutritious food and meaningful work that is based on a renewable natural resource.</p> <p>Additionally, apart from the negative effects an LNG facility on Digby Island could have on wild fish and on my livelihood, I am deeply concerned about the effects it will have on my community.</p> <p>Though I am seventy-two, I lead an active, relatively low-stress life - largely made possible because I live in Dodge Cove. Having waterfront property allows me to continue commercial fishing. Out of financial necessity I do most of my own repairs and maintenance. When a job is beyond my abilities (I never learned to weld and my joints will no longer handle some of the heavy work) I have helpful neighbours. As well, a historically significant commercial boat shed and marine repair business is again operating successfully in Dodge Cove.</p> <p>Commercial fishing, saw milling and boat building/repairing are still a part of Dodge Cove's long tradition as a working community. It is fortunate for me and for other residents that, though at reduced levels, these enterprises still exist here.</p> <p>My involvement in this community is rewarding and entertaining. Dodge Cove is a place where I often get together with my neighbours. We drink (mostly tea or coffee); tell a few stories (mostly when we're not drinking tea or coffee); have salmon barbecues; go to the schoolhouse for a dance, a meeting or a movie; celebrate the winter solstice or other occasion with a bonfire at Casey Cove; skate or swim at Wahl Lake; hike the nature trails; participate in the annual bird count; and take walks (often with visitors) up CBC Hill or Mount Comblain for the exercise and for the still beautiful panoramic views. Life here isn't idyllic but it's pretty nice.</p> <p>In Dodge Cove we try to be respectful of others. There's no violence or crime. It's not crowded and is reasonably quiet. Because we are an environmentally aware community, pollution from inside the Cove is minimal. The people here are resilient and capable of dealing with normal adversity. Having an LNG facility so close to where we live is a potential disaster we had not anticipated. We worry what it will do to our health, our community and our environment.</p> <p>Respectfully, Bill Smith</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concern regarding the potential effects on fish and knock-on effects on fisheries and livelihoods. Aurora LNG recognizes the importance of these valuable social, ecological and economic considerations and, for this reason, has considered each a focus of the Environmental Assessment. With respect to effects on fish, Aurora LNG must comply with the Fisheries Act, the purpose of which is to "provide for the sustainability and ongoing productivity of commercial, recreational and Aboriginal fisheries". Moreover, the Fisheries Act states that a Project must not impede a fishway (Section 20), cause serious harm to fish (Section 35[1]), except with authorization from the Minister (Section 35[2-b]), or release deleterious substances to the environment (Section 36[3]). To this end, Aurora LNG has developed a conceptual fish habitat offsetting plan as a first step towards creating a widely accepted, effective habitat offsetting plan. The objectives of the conceptual plan are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) demonstrate Aurora LNG's commitment to complying with the Fisheries Act,</li> <li>(2) demonstrate Aurora LNG's understanding of serious harm to fish and related habitat offsetting, and</li> <li>(3) suggest realistic but conceptual ideas for habitat offsetting to provide a starting point for constructive discussions with First Nations and stakeholders regarding Aurora LNG's habitat offsetting.</li> </ol> <p>Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated. However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels.</p> <p>Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Section 6.4 (Land and Resource Use) provides, among other considerations, an assessment of adverse effects on outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing and vegetation and marine plant harvesting and gathering occurring on Digby Island. See Section 6.6 (Community Health) of the Application of the assessment of change in community health and wellness (includes consideration of medical and mental health incidents, income and social status, social support network, social environments, and personal health practices and coping skills). Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application is provided in Section 13.5. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p>
1065	2017-03-07	Tom Spiller - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>My name is Tom Spiller. I have been a resident of Dodge Cove for most of forty-five years. The siting of the proposed Aurora Nexen-Inpex LNG plant on Digby Island is very much of concern to me. For the last thirty years I've been active in maintaining the public water system here. The proposed road to access the LNG plant and construction camp is much too close to our watershed. The LNG plant is much too close upwind of us. The toxins from the industry will be coming directly at us in the air I breathe and into the watershed I draw from.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>The access road to the LNG facility was recently moved further away from the watershed boundary for the Dodge Cove water reservoir, to address concerns expressed by Dodge Cove residents. Please see the technical memo "Dodge Cove Water Supply and Watershed" for more detail. The technical memo will be filed with the BC EAO.</p>
1066	2017-03-07	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>On the subject of the exploration activities conducted under the Licence for Investigative Use for the Aurora LNG Project on Digby Island:</p> <p>To July 2016, according to information from the proponent, the company has conducted 96 bore holes to test the geology of the substrate: 94 on land, 2 intertidal. Many many core samples have been removed, crated and shipped for analysis. Plans are being made for more investigative work in 2017: months of more helicopters, more drilling, more shipping of samples. The proponent has stated that the use of helicopters, up to three in the air at a time, is obviating the need for building roads to obtain samples and is "greener". Certainly, if roads needed to be built, these would be difficult and expensive undertakings, given the extent of the bogs, ponds and uneven terrain. The company has tried to minimize its impact, but inevitably has cut down trees to build platforms and landing pads over bogs, and created extensive foot trails for workers. I have seen some of these, both on a helicopter tour the proponent offered when I asked questions (which was unnecessary but commendable) and by walking in. Others have seen them in overflights to and from the nearby Digby Island airport. I have pictures, including the stump of a bog pine that, despite its small diameter, is impossible to age by counting the rings as they are too tight to see by eye, obviously some hundreds of years. There is a significant impact to this investigative activity. Though the proponent is committed to restoring the habitat if there is a decision to not go ahead, I submit that this impact is long lasting and irremediable in the fragile bog environment, which is incredibly slow to mature and cannot readily absorb change. A felled tree is a dead tree. I do not accept that the pervasive use of helicopters makes an industry green: the immense quantities of fuel consumed contribute to overall global greenhouse gas production, and don't seem to be included in the models for emissions production. In my opinion, the ecological disturbance, irremediable effects and emissions production put the lie to any argument that this industry is green even in its initial phases.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Project effects on old forest and peatlands, such as bogs have been characterized as long-term in duration, which means the effects will last beyond the life of the Project. Nonetheless, reclamation is proposed and Aurora LNG considers this a viable mitigation measure considering the successful research trials and methods of peatland restoration that have been developed in conjunction with the horticultural/agricultural sector and oil &amp; gas sectors in North America and Europe. Examples of research institutes with publications that address the restoration of peatlands include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <p>Peatland Ecology Research Group at the University of Laval, <a href="http://www.gret-perg.ulaval.ca/">http://www.gret-perg.ulaval.ca/</a> See: Quinty, F. and L. Rochefort, 2003. Peatland Restoration Guide, second edition. Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association and New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources and Energy. Québec, Québec.</p> <p>and,</p> <p>Peatland Restoration program at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology <a href="http://www.nait.ca/70709.htm">http://www.nait.ca/70709.htm</a></p> <p>In a number of areas of the application, we used a conservative approach for our modelling and analysis to determine the highest potential impact our project may have. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities, which may reduce the project's overall impact.</p> <p>The GHG estimates are based on the facility operating at full load throughout the operations phase, which is not likely to occur given the Project is currently proposed to be built over two phases, adding trains three and four at a later stage.</p> <p>Within the application, 14 separate air emission mitigations have been identified and are expected to be implemented. As well, a Greenhouse Gas Management Plan will be created and will include best achievable technology analysis.</p>

1067 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 1: I believe that it is the governments' job to study the impacts that LNG terminals have had in other areas of the world, to other communities, while assessing the impact that any proposed development would have here. Yes, we are a unique area that will have some different concerns and levels of impact compared to a different location, but if the data is available, if the scientific studies are done, and if it can be duly noted on the impacts that LNG terminals have had in other areas, I think that gives a wider understanding to some of the issues this region, and the communities of Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert would face. Some of these issues may have already been looked at by CNOOC-Nexen for the Aurora LNG terminal, but many of these have been overlooked as well, or data and reports from other areas haven't been looked at, and from interests outside of the company wanting to build Aurora LNG. Here is a report from Europe, and it details such topics such as rape! What impact will this have to residents of Prince Rupert? How safe will the women and children in this town be? How safe will the residents of Dodge Cove be with a 5000 man work camp a 10 min stroll through the woods? The impacts to the housing market in Europe was drastic - with local residents having no chance to purchase houses, and increased homelessness and lack of rentals available at reasonable prices, (this we are already seeing here in Prince Rupert), and also additional costs to planning etc to the local communities, taxpayer money dealing with many issues. How is that ok, for municipal governments to bear the brunt of many different costs associated with this type of development? Have the sociological impacts to this region been looked at accurately and without bias, or are all reports on this being presented by CNOOC- Nexen? SOCIAL IMPACTS OF LNG REPORT TO THE PEMBROKESHIRE HAVEN SPATIAL PLANNING GROUP November 2005 Ref: KW/JB "CRIME Between May and October 2005 the police have had to attend approximately 30 incidents that have occurred as a direct result of LNG construction ranging from allegations of theft to rape. A typical offence resulting from a suspicion of indecent assault involved 120 hours of investigation at a cost of approximately £1,850, interpreter's costs of £5,000 and custody costs in excess of £2,000. The cost of this one investigation totalled approximately £9,000. The police have expressed concern about ensuring that there are sufficient additional resources to address additional crime and disorder resulting from LNG related construction, rather than dilute the quality of service elsewhere.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concern raised by the comment. While the quoted publication was not referenced in the Application, numerous others were included. These case studies include; Hammerfest, Norway; Kitimat, BC; Terrace BC; Williston, North Dakota; North Berwick, Maine; and Gladstone, Australia. With respect to the quoted case study in the comment, the majority of themes, effect mechanisms and potential effects identified have been addressed in the economic and social environment sections of the Application. Please refer to the following sections of the Application for more information; 5.2 Economic Conditions; 6.2 Visual Quality; 6.3 Infrastructure and Service; 6.4 Land and Resource Use; 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters; 6.6 Community Health; and Section 13.5 Public Consultation (subsection 'Issues and Concerns Not Addressed in Part B of the Application). Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect perceived levels of safety in the community of Dodge Cove. Assessed in Section 6.6 of the Application (Community Health), with the implementation of mitigation measures (e.g., on-site security services, a worker code of conduct, worker orientation and a Community Engagement Plan) and through the use of a closed access camp (meaning that Project employees will be encouraged to remain onsite for the duration of their shifts), effects related to the presence of workers on Digby Island, such as changes in privacy and security, will be mitigated. It is understood that the behavior or perceptions of the community may change in response the presence of a workcamp; however, a full range of mitigation measures are planned to address potential impacts to community health. This includes: The implementation of a Health and Medical Services Plan Providing employees access to an employee assistance program to help manage the physical, mental, cultural and social health of our workforce. Implementing an alcohol and drug policy focused on pre-placement testing, awareness, prevention and control of use to reduce the potential risks to employees and the community. Providing recreational and entertainment amenities within the facility to reduce demands on the community. Providing security services on site reduce the potential for unauthorized access and crime. Implementing a Transportation Management Plan to address increases in vehicle, ferry and airport traffic. As noted in Section 13.5 (subsection 'Social Cohesion'), with respect to potential adverse changes on social cohesion due to the presence and activities of workers on Digby Island, Aurora LNG is committed to maintaining safety in all Project activities.</p>
1067 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>HOUSING IMPACTS General Pembrokeshire and adjoining coastal rural communities generally have a relatively small housing stock, higher levels of second home ownerships, high level of in-movers for retirement and low wages, which in normal circumstances create enormous pressures in the local housing market for rental and purchase. Affordability of housing for local residents is a problem. The Chartered Institute of housing policy briefing "Young Working &amp; Homeless identified Pembrokeshire as having the second highest house price to income ratio in Wales in 2004.</p> <p>HOMELESSNESS Public sector provision of accommodation is reducing year on year with total tenancies in 2002/03 totalling 8282 and in 2004/05 totalling 7862. The County Council's tenancies reduced from 6332 to 5848 with a small increase in Pembrokeshire Housing Association and Cantref tenancies. The numbers of homelessness applications received by the Council have been increasing steadily year on year. During July to September (Q2 2005), the number of applications increased substantially at a time when a reduction in applications would have been expected compared to the previous quarter. Closer analysis of the reason for the homelessness shows an increase in the numbers of homeless applications as a result of loss of private rented sector accommodation during the same period. Anecdotal evidence from homeless customers indicates that a number of landlords have terminated tenancies to let to LNG workers at higher rents than can be paid by the former tenants. There is a concern however that the lack of affordable properties to purchase or for rent is having a detrimental effect on recruitment within the Health Service. The Ambulance service had identified the need for a paramedic/EMT crew and a fully equipped ambulance when an early calculation suggested a population increase of 3,000 – 4,000 men. This early assessment will now require review in terms of numbers and ambulance response times.</p>	

1068 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: TRANSPORT The County Council has undertaken an initial preliminary assessment of traffic impacts based on information available in September 2005. This information indicated up to 20,000 additional movements per day at peak in Milford Haven and Pembroke Dock there is a lack of a public transport intermodal focal point for all transport services</p> <p>OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES In addition to housing and transport services, the Council has been or will be affected by LNG related activity and other major projects in a number of other ways (planning is one). The County Council and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority are both affected by LNG related developments. The fee received in respect of the LNG terminals was: Exxon site, National Park £16,620 Exxon and Dragon sites, PCC £33,880 The estimate of costs involved in processing these applications, and preparing evidence for Judicial Review, instructing solicitors etc is as follows: PCC in-house legal costs 40,000 External legal costs Other staff costs 32,000 £80,000 Total 152,000 PCNPA External legal (excludes internal staff costs) £100,000 - 13 - Note: These costs are in addition to an estimated £45,000 to PCC and £55,000 net to PCNPA of costs incurred in respect of the Bluestone Holiday Village planning application and review. PCNPA estimate that at least 1.5 work years has been taken up in dealing with both Reviews. The total costs to both Authorities could increase considerably in the future. PCNPA were awarded full costs of £100,000 in respect of the LNG judicial review but as the applicants were in receipt of legal aid no costs were forthcoming. It is considered inappropriate for local Council taxpayers to have to bear the cost of processing applications which are clearly developments needed in the 'National Interest'.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>The quoted case study was not evaluated in relation to the Aurora LNG Project. However, effect mechanisms described in the provided case study are largely captured in 6.3 (Infrastructure and Services) of the Application. In particular, increased demand on waste disposal and education is assessed in Section 6.3.5.2 'Assessment of Change in Community Infrastructure and Services' (with additional information provided in the technical memo 'Supplemental Baseline Information for Infrastructure and Services') while changes in accommodations are assessed in Section 6.3.5.3 'Assessment of Change in Accommodations' with additional information on private property values provided in Section 13.5.3 'Private Property Values'; Consideration of fees charged by BC EAO versus the cost of local communities to engage in EA processes was not included in the Application.</p>
1068 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Waste Disposal Any increase in resident numbers will have a proportionate impact on the waste system. Evidence to date indicates that recycling initiatives are disregarded in many properties occupied by in-migrant workers and 1-2% increase in temporary residents will make recycling targets more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Education The adult education service has seen a significant increase in English language tuition across a wide range of European and Eastern languages. It is estimated that current construction activity has resulted in a significant increase in construction costs of around 25% over the last year. It is difficult to determine the exact increase due to contractors picking and choosing which projects they are prepared to tender for. There was a period in 2004 when some schemes failed to attract any tenders as local contractors had sufficient work on their books. Some School projects saw the cost of construction per square meter double over a 3 year period. All in all, local "first time buyers have no chance". Rental prices were felt to be largely out of the scope of local people with poorly (local wage rates) paid jobs. Significant problems are faced by those with no family, people living on a single income and those with low paid jobs. One interviewee talked of comparatively old (22 - 30) young people unable to leave home and move into flats because of the cost. This was considered to have a sociological impact on the young people of the county. Reference was made by one interviewee to lower paid people unable to live in Pembrokeshire and moving out towards Tenby and even out of county to areas where rental costs were lower. All interviewed said that stories about the eviction of tenants in order to obtain greater income from LNG clients are true, although this is not universal. There is significant evidence of landlords seeking the short term gain from the LNG projects. A comment made by several interviewees was that the Council seemed to be "grateful" that the projects had come to Milford, yet commensurate increase in wage rates or an increase in affluence for the lower paid sector of the economy. Reference was made by three of those interviewed that much of the rental revenue made by landlords was not returned to the local economy. The view was also expressed that the Oil companies had yet to convince the local people of the benefit to the local economy from their activities, and their lack of commitment to the local area - citing the terms that had been negotiated in Scotland between Oil companies and affected communities."</p>	
1069	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Price Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Hi. I'm an 18 year old who grew up in Prince Rupert and is still living there today. It is unfair to the residents of Digby Island who do not support having LNG right in their backyards. Both they, residents of Prince Rupert, and every living creature on this pristine coast will be put at risk by pollution and sea traffic that LNG will bring to the North Coast of BC. We already have enough on our plates regarding to pollution in the Pacific. Fukushima, massive garbage patches, and spills. What is the use of bringing in an industry which isn't particularly flourishing in the market, primarily hires over-seas workers, brings staggering amounts of health hazards to people and other organisms alike, and could very likely be replaced in only some years by alternative methods of energy and job creation? The North Coast has been doing quite well without LNG for years and still grows healthily to this day! With tourism, fishing, logging, exporting and importing goods through our port. Two of these, tourism and fishing, will be put at risk by LNG. That is not healthy for us. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. LNG isn't our last hope for the economy and well-being of the North Coast and rest of BC. We still grow everyday without LNG. (The attachment is some photos of residents here who are unable to send a comment, question or concern.)</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment and acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove more so than any other local community in the region. With the implementation of environmental and socio-economic specific mitigation measures it is anticipated that issues such as health hazards, pollution and invasive organisms will be limited. Aurora LNG is committed to providing positive and beneficial effects in the local community both from an environmental and socio-economic perspective.</p>
1070	2017-03-07	Shaheer Mawani - Australia	<p>Once companies spend money on EIA statements it is very difficult to deny access by governments. I know because I am an offshore oil and gas engineer for Chevron. What's more is that more often than not EIA statements are 1000 page plus documents hiding the truth, misinterpreting the laws, and rarely ever include lessons learned from other areas. It is the government's duty to STOP Companies contemplating development in or around such environmentally sensitive areas such as Digby island. Open your eyes look at history and the Devi station this will cause. Think of the future, not only the now. STOP THIS IN ITS TRACKS BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

1071	2017-03-07	Josiah - Terrace, British Columbia	The LNG facility should not be built on Digby Island! The environmental risks are to great	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1072	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Lake Cowichan, British Columbia	NO LNG on digby island	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1073	2017-03-07	Personal Information Withheld - Kitimat, British Columbia	its not worth the risk. The Earth is being ravaged by our inability to change and evolve. It is time to stop our dependence on oil and gas and look to clean sources of energy and fuel. Please demonstrate true leadership and stewardship for the Earth and all it's inhabitants and say no to LNG.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1074 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Norma Kerby - Terrace, British Columbia	<p>From: Northern Amphibians Naturalists Society.  To: Sean Moore, Project Assessment Manager,  Re: Proposed LNG project, Digby Island, Prince Rupert, B.C.  Dear Mr. Moore:</p> <p>The Northern Amphibians Naturalists Society is a registered society with the Province of British Columbia. Located in the nonhwestern quadrat of British Columbia, we operate a volunteer monitoring program for amphibians and reptiles, the Northwest BC Reptile and Amphibian Monitoring Progam (NWBC RAMP), recording observations of incidental occurences and life cycle events, such as breeding activities, migrations, hibernation, and mortality. As part of this volunteer citizen science endeavour, we also monitor permanent locations, including ponds, wetlands, and installed cover boards, allowing sightings to be compared from year to year. This volunteer program has operated from 2011 to date, With monitoring stations spread from Ft. St. James in the east, Dease Lake in the north, Kitimat in the south, to Prince Rupert in the west.</p> <p>Two of the permanent monitoring stations for NW BC have been located on Digby Island since 2014 - Site DI DC 01 10 03 ( 0409424E 6016622N) Site DI 01 to 03 (0409716E 60178N). Each of these sites includes a visual survey area and three installed wooden cover boards. A further six sites with three cover boards each are located in the Prinee Rupert area at Diana Lake (since 2011), Port Edward (since 2011), Oldfield Creek (since 2011), and Moresby Creek (since 2014).</p> <p>It is our concern that the proposed LNG project on Digby Island represents a real threat to amphibian populations on the island and that the information provided by the proponent to the Environmental Assessment process does not adequately give sufficient information or discussion regarding preservation of these amphibians. We would like to present our perspective regarding our concerns for two amphibian species in particular - the Northwestern Salamander and the Western Toad, and the potential impacts that this proposal presents to the long-term stability of these animals on Digby Island.</p> <p>The monitoring results in the Prince Rupert area and on Digby Island have allowed our Society to obtain important observations regarding amphibians on the North Coast and on Digby Island. Four amphibian species have been most frequently sighted - the roughskin newt (<i>Taricha granulosa</i> - common on the mainland; not recorded by our monitors on Digby Island), Long-toed Salamander (<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i> - less common, infrequently sighted on Digby Island by local residents), Northwestern Salamander (<i>Ambystoma gracile</i> - common on the mainland and Digby Island), and the Provincially blue listed and SARA listed Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreas</i> - recorded on both the mainland and Digby Island).</p> <p>Two amphibian species on Digby Island most commonly occurring in our monitoring results and incidental sightings, the Northwestern Salamander and the Western Toad, would both be negatively impacted by development of the proposed Aurora LNG project.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the Project to terrestrial wildlife, including amphibians present on Digby Island.</p> <p>Field studies and habitat community and suitability modelling were completed to characterize existing conditions for amphibians on Digby Island to develop effective mitigation measures for this species. Detection records provided by the Northern Amphibians Naturalist Society are consistent with amphibian observations recorded on Digby Island during field studies which include regular detections of both western toad and northwestern salamander (Appendix J of the Application).</p> <p>Section 4.7.5 of the Application outlines several mitigation measures that Aurora LNG has proposed to reduce potential residual effects of construction and operation on local amphibian populations. Table 4.7-17 specifically identifies the mitigation measures that Aurora LNG has proposed to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential Project effects to western toad. Although the proposed Management Plan for the Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreas</i>) in Canada was released around the time of the Aurora LNG Application submission to the BC EAO, Project mitigation measures are consistent with regional management objectives outlined in the plan (ECCC 2016).</p> <p>Briefly, these measures include habitat protection, relocation efforts, and measures to reduce traffic speed and volume. However, Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by local Aboriginal Groups, communities, and government agencies on the potential for injury or mortality during dispersal. Based on the characterization of current amphibian habitat use and distribution, in combination with the feedback received from stakeholders, Aurora LNG is further committing to facilitating amphibian passage while reducing potential for harm. As per mitigation 4.7.12, drift fencing will be installed along sections of roadway to direct dispersing individuals away from the access road and towards passage corridors (e.g., culverted riparian crossings). Drift fencing installed along riparian corridors that intersect with the access road are expected to be effective in reducing potential for injury or mortality in these locations.</p> <p>To further reduce potential residual effects of the Project to salamanders and toads, guidelines for restricted activity periods to protect amphibians will be followed where practicable (BC MOE 2014; BC MFLNRO 2014). Clearing activities will occur outside of the breeding season for amphibians (March 1 through August 15), where possible. In accordance with mitigation measure 4.7.19, if clearing or disturbance of open water wetland sites within the PDA cannot avoid the amphibian breeding period, salvage will be completed subject to permit approval under the BC Wildlife Act. Procedures for amphibian salvage will be outlined in the Wildlife Management Plan and will be conducted following Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia (BC MFLNRO 2016).</p> <p>Amphibian salvage during the breeding season is expected to be an effective means of reducing the likelihood of mortality as individuals are concentrated at breeding locations, and the ability to detect and capture individuals of all life stages (e.g., eggs, tadpoles or larvae, juveniles, or adults) is improved. Salvaged individuals will be relocated, subject to applicable permits, to proximal areas of suitable habitat beyond the PDA boundaries. Wetland habitats on Digby Island with similar habitat attributes and/or where those species were previously detected will be preferred relocation areas and would also consider important monitoring sites identified by the Northern Amphibians Naturalists Society.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1074 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Norma Kerby - Terrace, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Northwestern Salamander</p> <p>The Northwestern Salamander (<i>Ambystoma gracile</i>) has consistently been recorded on and adjacent to our monitoring sites on Digby Island. The egg masses of Northwestern Salamanders are large and globular and very easy to identify. Egg masses are found consistently in ponds within and adjacent to both of our monitoring locations and, by incidental sightings, occur also throughout the wetlands and bogs of southern Digby Island. As the egg masses are large and obvious, they are susceptible to both disturbance by humans, as well as predation by birds, especially waterfowl. Opening up of cover around breeding ponds or streams is most likely associated with higher mortality of the egg masses. The egg masses (and adults) have also been identified as being susceptible to changes in water quality e.g. lower water quality draining from development sites or piles of stored surficial materials would be detrimental to development of the salamander larvae, and has been noted in some of the literature as affecting the health of adults.</p> <p>Adult Northwestern Salamanders have been found associated with our monitoring boards and by incidental sightings. These salamander are large and robust as adults, up to 15 cm or longer. Their prime habitat is undisturbed forests with complicated surface structures or wetland complexes, although we have found them associated with smaller woody debris complexes in pockets separated by less desirable habitat, but with connectivity between the pockets (e.g. drainage hollows).</p> <p>As secretive animals which spend much of their time underground in wet hollows or cracks in rock or forested landscapes, under woody debris complexes, or in animal burrows or tunnels, they are very susceptible to changes in surface vegetation cover and changes which eliminate or crush organic debris and organic debris/vegetation cover. These salamanders would be directly impacted by industrial site development, waste soil dumps, road networks, and industrial pads, plus any changes to the complexes of south Digby Island which might raise or lower the water levels. Northwestern Salamanders are also very susceptible to mortality when they cross roads, especially during their migrations in spring to and from breeding ponds and streams, and their migrations in the fall to hibernation ponds. proposed road network on Digby Island would be a direct new mortality factor for these salamanders.</p> <p>Northwestern salamanders do not survive in environments without proposed modifications to the surface unconsolidated vegetation and organic soils on Digby Island would be a direct deletion of salamander habitat. Changes to the extent, quality, and stability of wetlands, bogs, and ponds will directly affect the amount of breeding habitat available to the salamanders. As salamander show a high degree of fidelity to breeding locations, these breeding sites need to be identified within the proposed project area and protected. It would also be beneficial if sufficient feeding ranges, both aquatic and moist forest, were associated with each breeding site for use by the juvenile and adult salamanders.</p> <p>The most important factor, though, which will affect survival of Nonhwestern Salamanders within the proposed Aurora project area, will be the amount of complex surface cover, rich in layers of organic decay and debris, with sufficient breeding locations, which remain as salamander habitat. The second most important factors will be the mortality associated with industrial impacts on water quality and the impacts of mortality from vehicle traffic on road networks and industrial pads.</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Through mitigation 4.6.9, Aurora LNG is committing to maintaining existing hydrological regimes and natural flow patterns; stormwater collection, treatment, and disposal will be managed during construction and operations. As outlined in Section 14.9 of the Application, the Marine and Freshwater Resources Management Plan will also introduce several measures to maintain freshwater habitats and water quality on Digby Island, including erosion and sediment control, water quality monitoring, and mitigation measures for sediment disposal. Collectively, these measures are intended to maintain hydrological regimes and wetland function to aquatic, bog, and forested swamp habitats within the LAA to allow for the persistence of the wetlands throughout Project operations. The measures that Aurora LNG is committing to reduce potential effects to amphibians and amphibian habitat are expected to be effective in maintaining the viability populations on Digby Island.</p> <p>References; British Columbia Ministry of Environment (BC MOE). 2014. Develop with Care; Environmental Guidelines for Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia. Available at; <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main</a>. Accessed; April 2016. British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2014. A Compendium of Wildlife Guidelines for Industrial Development Projects in the North Area, British Columbia, Interim Guidance, North Area. 212 pp. BC Ministry of Forest, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2016. Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia. Victoria, BC. 57 pp. Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC). 2016. Management Plan for the Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreas</i>) in Canada [Proposed]. Species at Risk Act Management Plan Series. Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ottawa. iv + 38 pp.</p>
1075 (1 of 2)	2017-03-07	Norma Kerby - Terrace, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: Note: photos not attached, see EAO website</p> <p>2. Western Toad</p> <p>Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreus</i>) is a species which is blue listed in the Province of British Columbia and is a species of concern under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) for the Federal Government. Western Toads have been experiencing serious declines throughout their southern ranges due to both diseases and loss of habitat. The Western Toads of the North Coast may represent important healthy populations for long term preservation of toads in the Province of British Columbia.</p> <p>Due to concerns regarding Western Toads, a new SARA management plan for Western Toads is being undertaken at this time. Public input was encouraged this winter. For the draft plan, see: (see <a href="http://www.registrelep-sararegistry.qc.ca/document/default_e.frm">http://www.registrelep-sararegistry.qc.ca/document/default_e.frm</a>).</p> <p>Digby Island has Western Toads. We have found them throughout our monitoring area and at our monitoring sites. Local residents have made many incidental notations of their occurrences. The mature adult toads on Digby Island are large (some over 12 cm in length) and show an interesting variation in colours and markings. They are nocturnal and come out to feed at night on insects and worms.</p> <p>Toads breed throughout the south end of Digby Island, where the proposed LNG project is proposed to occur. Several aspects of the proposed Aurora project are in direct conflict with the preservation of the healthy populations of Western Toads on Digby Island. Removal of wetlands and natural forest cover will delete breeding ponds, rearing ponds, and feeding habitat. Development of a road network on the island will lead to increased mortality rates for the toads, especially during migration times to breeding ponds or fall hibernation sites, outward migration of toadlets from rearing ponds, and during insect proliferation events when the toads migrate on to warm surfaces (which roads and industrial pads would present) to feed on the insects at night.</p> <p>There no doubt that industrial development will affect the toads on Digby Island. Removal of toads from ponds or wetlands within the development area to other Digby Island locations will not work, as the toad populations are relatively stable to the available habitat, and addition of extra toads to a location does not necessarily mean that sufficient rood or breeding space will become available.</p> <p>We have concerns that the Aurora Proposal has not identified the breeding and rearing sites for blue-listed Western Toads. It has not identified critical habitat, nor has it adequately addressed how mortality from vehicle impacts will be reduced on any industrial pads or roadways. The question as to whether this island population of toads is genetically unusual relative to the mainland toads has also been addressed.</p> <p>We have enclosed with this submission a sampling of the wide variety of toad colours and markings present on Digby Island toads, which suggests some interesting genetics, as well as the size and healthy population numbers of the toads.</p> <p>We do not feel that the issue of Western Toads and preservation Of Western Toad critical habitat been been adequately addressed in the Aurora LNG proposal.</p> <p>Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the Proposed Aurora LNG project on Digby Island, Prince Rupert. Please find attached our document showing examples of Western Toads found near our monitoring sites on Digby Island.</p> <p>Dr. Norma Kerby, Volunteer Project Coordinator, NWBC Reptile and Amphibian Monitoring Program, President, Northern Amphibians Naturalist Society</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project to terrestrial wildlife.</p> <p>Western toad was identified as a focal species with potential to interact with Project activities and infrastructure. Field studies and habitat suitability modelling were completed to characterize existing conditions for western toad on Digby Island to develop effective mitigation measures for this species. Appendix J of the Application describes and illustrates important habitats for western toad breeding. However, as a species designated as Special Concern on Schedule 1, no critical habitat has been defined for this species at this time (COSEWIC 2012). A combination of colour variants of western toad were observed during Project field studies, which is a natural feature in the species. Several colour variants in western toad are typically observed in this region and is not necessarily associated with specific phylogenetic populations (COSEWIC 2012).</p> <p>Table 4.7-17 outlines the mitigation measures that Aurora LNG has proposed to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential Project effects to western toad. Although the proposed Management Plan for the Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreas</i>) in Canada was released around the time of the Aurora LNG Application submission to the BC EAO, Project mitigation measures are consistent with regional management objectives outlined in the plan (ECCC 2016). These include habitat protection, relocation efforts, and measures to reduce traffic speed and volume. However, Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised by local Aboriginal groups, communities, and government agencies on the potential for injury or mortality during dispersal. Based on the characterization of current western toad habitat use and distribution, in combination with the feedback received from stakeholders, Aurora LNG is further committing to facilitating amphibian passage while reducing potential for harm. As per mitigation 4.7.12, drift fencing will be installed along sections of roadway to direct dispersing individuals away from the access road and towards passage corridors (e.g., culverted riparian crossings).</p> <p>Western toad observations during Project field studies show a reasonable verification of the habitat suitability model (Figures 6 and 10 of Appendix J of the Application). Western toads were detected more frequently and in larger numbers in, or adjacent to high and moderate suitability polygons supporting larger wetlands within the LAA. Adult and juvenile dispersing western toads appeared to have some association with riparian corridors within the LAA. However, no large migration events were observed in these areas. Drift fencing installed along riparian corridors that intersect with the proposed access road are expected to be effective in reducing potential for injury or mortality in these locations.</p> <p>To further reduce potential residual effects of the Project to western toad, guidelines for restricted activity periods to protect amphibians will be followed where practicable (BC MOE 2014; BC MFLNRO 2014). Clearing activities will occur outside of the breeding season for amphibians (March 1 through August 15), where possible. In accordance with mitigation measure 4.7.19, if clearing or disturbance of open water wetland sites within the PDA cannot avoid the amphibian breeding period, salvage will be completed subject to permit approval under the BC Wildlife Act. Procedures for amphibian salvage will be outlined in the Wildlife Management Plan and will be conducted following Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia (BC MFLNRO 2016).</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1075 (2 of 2)	2017-03-07	Norma Kerby - Terrace, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Amphibian salvage during the breeding season is expected to be an effective means of reducing the likelihood of mortality as individuals are concentrated at breeding locations, and the ability to detect and capture individuals of all life stages (e.g., eggs, tadpoles or larvae, juveniles, or adults) is improved. Salvaged individuals will be relocated, subject to applicable permits, to proximal areas of suitable habitat beyond the PDA boundaries. Wetland habitats on Digby Island with similar habitat attributes and/or where western toads were previously detected will be preferred relocation areas. The collective measures that Aurora LNG is committing to reduce effects to western toad are expected to be effective in maintaining the viability of toad populations on Digby Island.</p> <p>References;  British Columbia Ministry of Environment (BC MOE). 2014. Develop with Care; Environmental Guidelines for Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia. Available at: <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/devwithcare/index.html#Main</a>. Accessed; April 2016.  British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2014. A Compendium of Wildlife Guidelines for Industrial Development Projects in the North Area, British Columbia, Interim Guidance, North Area. 212 pp.  BC Ministry of Forest, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (BC MFLNRO). 2016. Best Management Practices for Amphibian and Reptile Salvages in British Columbia. Victoria, BC. 57 pp.  Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC). 2012. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Western Toad <i>Anaxyrus boreas</i> in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. xiv + 71 pp.  Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC). 2016. Management Plan for the Western Toad (<i>Anaxyrus boreas</i>) in Canada [Proposed]. Species at Risk Act Management Plan Series. Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ottawa. iv + 38 pp.</p>
1076	2017-03-08	Sarah Findlay - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office  RE: Comment on Aurora LNG  Aurora LNG is a BAD IDEA ... there are better, cheaper and more environmentally friendly ways to create power. International markets are in decline as other jurisdictions go green ... this is not acceptable ... fracking must STOP as it is polluting aquifers and causing earthquakes ... just STOP it  Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.  Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.  Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.  Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.  This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.  Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.  Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!  Sarah Findlay  Vancouver, BC  CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman  Dear EAO,  Sincerely,  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1077	2017-03-08	Eric Davidson - Lake Country , British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office  RE: Comment on Aurora LNG  I wish to comment on the proposed Aurora LNG project for Dodge Cove. This project should not proceed for the following reasons:  Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.  Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.  Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.  Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.  This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.  Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.  Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!  Eric Davidson  Lake Country , B.C.  CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1078	2017-03-08	Chris Jones, Ferne	<p>Dear EAO,  The proposed LNG pipeline for Aurora seems to benefit a foreign corporation at the expense of some Canadian citizens.  The people who have lived here and depend upon the land to provide them food, water, and shelter should come first in the decision-making process, for some have been here for thousands of years.  There seems to be numerous risks that could affect their way of life with this LNG plant.  Sincerely,  Chris Jones, Ferne  cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns expressed in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including for the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to economic conditions, marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be manageable. with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p>



1079	2017-03-08	Malcolm Robinson - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>We know you people are trying to stuff this dirty business venture down our throats. And that it is by all means a safe and viable project according to your leading experts. My concern though is traffic density. I am employed at the port in Prince Rupert. We have our container ships logs ships coal and grain ships oh and pellets. All navigating our inside waters. We know by adding to the mix it is just a matter of time before we have a catastrophe on our hands. But I to pretty much live of the sea or harvest alot of what is in my freezer. My concrete is how drastically is this traffic density going to affect the migration of our fish and shellfish? Do you have any or such scientific numbers to back it up where as our stalks or numbers will not drastically decline or further become extinct because of traffic alone? We know where we are going with an accident or catastrophe with your ships. It is not if but when it does happen.</p> <p>RE: Comment on Aurora LNG CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1080	2017-03-08	Peter McCartney	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Wilderness Committee and our 60,000 supporters across the country in regards to the proposed Aurora LNG project on Digby Island in British Columbia.</p> <p>Wilderness Committee has many grave concerns about this project and therefore we oppose the development of the Aurora LNG project.</p> <p>First among our concerns is the immense carbon pollution that would be generated by the terminal. We estimate that it will produce 15 megatonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent every year. This is similar to the entire emissions of Metro Vancouver, and it is at odds with our legislated climate targets.</p> <p>Producing LNG in British Columbia undermines the hard work our citizens and municipalities are doing to reduce their emissions in other sectors. Not only will this be one of the most polluting projects in the country if it proceeds, but the gas will generate another 69MT of carbon pollution when it's burnt in Asia.</p> <p>Beyond the climate impacts of the proposed Aurora LNG, it will have major repercussions for the residents and wildlife on Digby Island and surrounding waters. The tiny community of Dodge Cove will never be the same if this proposal moves forward.</p> <p>Residents there have developed a sustainable community, and to bulldoze those dreams with this government's LNG ambitions is shameful.</p> <p>Their safety is at risk as well. LNG tankers pose a small but extreme risk according to a study commissioned for the U.S. military. It found that if a gas cloud released by an LNG tanker was ignited, the blast could reach between 1.6 and 2.5 kilometres, engulfing entire communities in flames.</p> <p>Clear design guidelines produced by the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators suggest that building an LNG plant on Digby Island near the busy Port of Prince Rupert is ill-advised. Planning for this project must take public safety concerns into account and it should not proceed until Canada has meaningful regulations on the siting of LNG terminals.</p> <p>Finally, the risk to wildlife posed by the project is immense. It would be located in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area as well as critical salmon habitat with values similar to the better-known Flora Bank. Noise from the tankers would have a significant impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia. Please reject the proposal for Aurora LNG as it is out of line with provincial, national and global commitments to combat climate change and it will have serious impacts on local residents and wildlife.</p> <p>CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p> <p>Thank you, Peter McCartney Climate Campaigner   Wilderness Committee</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1081	2017-03-08	Ahava Shira - Salt Spring Island, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>I am adding my voice to those who oppose the Digby Island LNG plant.</p> <p>LNG is a highly polluting form of energy that has already contaminated hundreds of lakes and water sources in BC. Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Not only will the people of the places surrounding the island be impacted, the wildlife will be severely effected. Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>As for the effects on climate change and reducing our carbon emissions, this facility would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. It would thus make it impossible for Aurora LNG impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>If we want to maintain our reputation as Beautiful British Columbia, we need to stop building new LNG plants and start focusing exclusively on renewable resources that DO NOT impact the natural world of BC in such harsh and unsustainable ways.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p> <p>CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p> <p>Ahava Shira Salt Spring Island, BC</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1082	2017-03-08	Emily Hoffpauir	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.</p> <p>This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p> <p>CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>

1083	2017-03-08	Emma Morgan-Thorp - Victoria, BC	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Hello, and thank you for taking the time to consider the perspective of one of your constituents, I am writing to emphatically oppose the Aurora LNG proposal for a gas plant at Dodge Cove. The residents of the area oppose this planned disruption to their lives; in fact, the project violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic. I am also concerned for the nonhuman residents of the area: noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, and on the great blue herons nesting at the Digby Island Nationally Significant Important Bird Area.</p> <p>Aside from site specifics, I am opposed to LNG development on the coast full stop. This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT. Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please put a halt to this project, for the sake of BC citizens, wildlife, and ecosystems.</p> <p>Emma Morgan-Thorp Victoria, BC CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1084	2017-03-08	Sandra Couch, Naperville	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, Sandra Couch, Naperville cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
1085	2017-03-08	Cristina Novelo, Cancún	<p>Dear EAO, Sincerely, cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
1086	2017-03-08	Janet kerpan - West Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>I had the honour of working for the canadian coast guard for several years on digby island before we were transferred to west vancouver. The privilege of being able to commute by boat to the most amazing island so extremely close to Prince Rupert but you felt like you were miles away. The coast guard was the first responders to any sea disaster and Prince Rupert being a small, close knit society, it was many times I took the call on a fishing boat being lost with whole families being lost at sea. I knew many of those families. The people of Prince Rupert are hard working people who pay a high price having to earn a living there. To allow the Chinese to destroy there way of life for financial gain is outrageous and against the law as Digby island is well within the 3.5 mile radius in relation to the town of Prince Rupert and it's citizens.we should be doing all we can to help the economy of Prince Rupert through tourism and fishing. Allowing this to go ahead Wil I destroy tourism and fishing and Digby island.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1087	2017-03-08	ml johnstone	<p>The duty of govts and citizens in these times is to protect our environments and restore the many areas already damaged by human activity. Therefore, this project should NOT be approved.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1088	2017-03-08	Robert Haslett - Smithers, British Columbia	<p>There is substantial risk to to the estuarine environment that should over ride any corporate need for profits in this development.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1089	2017-03-08	Ryan King - Victoria, British Columbia	<p>I do not accept or endorse this in any way. The risk of permanent damage to our coastline is not worth the financial benefit to a few business, with the taxpayers picking up the tab for all the risk. S</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1090	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Masset, Haida Gwaii British Columbia	<p>The Skeena Watershed is one of the last remaining major life sustaining watersheds in the North Pacific providing sustenance to most of the people, and the health of the timber and wildlife in the entire Skeena Region. What is the rationale for risking all this for something that has several suitable sites away from both the Skeena and Fraser watersheds? What kind of madness is this? The carbon industry is a cyclical, high risk and pathogenic industry that is falling out of favor fast. Please don't allow the short term gains blind us to the risks and side effects of this completely unwholesome decision. The Skeena and Fraser fisheries, and the timber produced by healthy watersheds has built and sustained British Columbia. Let us please wake up from whatever influence we're under and protect this most important of all our resources.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1091	2017-03-08	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>On the subject of Nexen ULC's avowed and advertised commitment to "relationship building" with "local community" for the Aurora LNG Project on Digby Island. Dodge Cove, where I live, is not a "potentially affected community". We are a "most definitely will be affected community". Residents in Dodge Cove do not feel that their interests have been adequately acknowledged or that they have been offered effective management plans. Company representatives have been to meetings with residents and politely listened, and even at times expressed sympathy for our concerns, some of which have been expressed to them as ranting and raving due to the strong emotions evoked. (However, one company employee told us that he had heard far worse in other places. Basic civility has been maintained). They have been, by and large quick in responding to questions (except when there was turnover in the staff: we have seen many changes in employees in two years, at least in community relations). For some months, after being alarmed several times by people conducting activities around us without notice, which we are very unaccustomed to, we received weekly updating phone calls. The proponent also took several residents on a helicopter tour of the site to answer questions, though such was not asked for. Once investigative work started, the proponent did reduce the helicopter activity to eleven hours a day, not starting before 7:30AM and not flying directly over our community after a series of complaints were lodged by residents: this went on for seven days a week for months and was difficult to bear even with the concessions. The activity was incessant, not over our homes but still all around the community, with mostly three and up to four helicopters in the air at once with frequent trips to Prince Rupert for refuelling and to transport workers.</p> <p>None of these measures, meetings, updates, concessions in helicopter routes and hours, which the proponent vaunts itself on and cites as part of its community engagement, come close in any way to palliating Dodge Cove's main concerns: proximity, destruction of habitat, and health and safety concerns. Dodge Cove came late to the table (self-invited) and has everything to lose and nothing to gain. With our intents at complete antipodes to those of the proponent, effective mitigation measures are non-existent. The proponent, to our knowledge, has not modified its plans to address our concerns, being given a licence by the Province to design with purposes and standards that we do not accept.</p> <p>In short the proponent cannot satisfy its legal requirement to make effective management plans in regard to Dodge Cove: this remains a virtual impossibility due to the proximity and infringement issues.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges concerns expressed in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including for the community of Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with local communities. Public consultation and engagement activities such as those noted in the comment resemble one way that Aurora LNG is engaging with local communities and stakeholders to achieve this objective and to provide beneficial outcomes.</p>

1092	2017-03-08	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>On Nexen's Public Engagement process: use of promotional materials to "inform" the public:  On a personal note, I am constantly incensed at the use of photos of the natural environment in the proponent's promotional material, including the small islands between Digby Island and Spire Ledge (Spire Island and Tuck Island) that will disappear under the proposed jetty for the tankers; the streams and beaches that will disappear under the concrete and storage tanks or within a security perimeter; the computer-generated graphics that idealize and sanitize the final concept; and the use of photos of trees and animals that we do not even have in this area (like what appears to be a mule deer and some coloured deciduous trees in the latest "Open House" brochure): disingenuous at best and intentionally misleading at worst. Clever public relations people can generate a seemingly endless stream of materials that smack more of propaganda than information. Calling the online newsletter by the clever double-entendre "Community Matters" is more of the same: the corpo ration does not exist for the benefit of the community and calling it so galls me.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges concerns expressed in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project. Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships. We have worked to regularly engage with Dodge Cove residents to understand their concerns and have sought to work collaboratively to find ways to mitigate against the potential impacts our project may have on their community. Our engagement with Dodge Cove residents to date has included:  Project update meetings and meetings with individual Dodge Cove residents  Regular notification of activities  Weekly scheduled phone call with Dodge Cove representatives  Letters addressing individual residents' concerns  Consultation throughout the Environmental Assessment (EA) process through the EA Working Group for Aurora LNG, which includes a representative from Dodge Cove  We feel this engagement has been very productive and has helped us understand Dodge Cove's needs and expectations if the development were to proceed.</p>
1093	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Paris	<p>Are you people living in the REAL world??  With all this dumping of millions of tonnes of pollutants into the air and heaven knows what damage in getting the stuff out of the ground, you must be nuts!!  With millions to be made, where the heck do you think you will be able to spend it when our earth is no longer safe or habitable for sentient life??  This is</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1094	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>These are questions and concerns I have about the entire process and the application for CNOOC-Nexen to build the Aurora LNG terminal on Digby Island.  No unbiased peer-reviewed science.  No accurate extensive unbiased baseline data.  Nexen needs to assess prediction confidence of the stakeholders not their own company - we are the stakeholders, we do not have any prediction confidence in the predictions they have made - we don't care if they are confident in their own oil and gas industry babble, that doesn't mean that our community of Dodge Cove won't be wiped out by a major LNG accident, or unlivable by noise, water, air pollution.  Nexen has real nice plans (that the public doesn't get to see before approval?) but they are only "plans" who exactly is monitoring and making sure . Plans/platitudes.  Nexen is using publicly available information and findings from recent studies on assessments LNG projects in the region. The "region" should include global. Since Canada has no operating export LNG terminals, the information used from the assessments should include actual real data from other LNG export terminal sites that are operating, not predictions and guesses from local LNG assessments that haven't even been operating. Nexen must have access to much more information about LNG terminals than what is publicly available. How come we don't know their work record or other information?  Nexen is owned by China, by the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation, China does things like displace populations for industry as well as other human rights infringements. How come we don't have the CNOOC human rights record and environmental record.  VC's were selected "information collected during baseline data and investigative use studies". What baseline data was used or collected previously to formulating the AIR? Nexen says "the selection of VC's followed applicable EAO guidance and involved refinement through gov't agencies". Rationale was supposed to be provided for why VC's were NOT looked at. Nexen says they were following the gov't advice (is that the members of the working group?) yet did NOT include many details in the AIR that the working group asked for.  What are the BCEA and CEAA guidelines if the working group concerns are considered "resolved" while the proponent actually hasn't addressed the concern or studied what the gov't agents on the working group are asking for? When the CEAA or BCEA or another gov't agent asks for futher information/data/science, Nexen should have to do it.  Whales beaching themselves to get away from the noise (atlantic canada). All over the world there are reports of whales beaching themselves to get away from the noise (mostly generated by the oil and gas industry and increased tanker traffic) so how come that isn't looked at here, with Humpback whales feeding all winter at the Skeena River Estuary, and Northern Orca Whale populations coming here to feed several times a year.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG believe that the Application provides a comprehensive and transparent environmental assessment, prepared by accredited, unbiased professionals, and is based upon sufficient and accurate baseline information. Aurora LNG recognizes that the community of Dodge Cove exhibits unique characteristics that are not necessarily shared with those of other communities within the local and regional assessment areas, and that potential adverse environmental socio-economic effects could be disproportionately realized by residents of Dodge Cove. The assessment, however, applies a conservative approach to the assessment of noise, water quality, and air quality, respectively found in Sections 4.4, 4.5 and 4.2 of the Application. With respect to a "major LNG accident", as outlined in the comment, Section 9 (Accidents or Malfunctions) of the Application, addresses several potential LNG accident and malfunction scenarios and describes the combination of preventative and protective measures which would be applied to reduce the risk of these potential scenarios.  Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify measures that will reduce potential Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. Aurora LNG will comply with monitoring requirements established during permitting, as per regulatory guidance, and further, are legally required to comply with monitoring and/or management conditions attached to a final Environmental Assessment Certificate, once approved.  With respect to the AIR, the document was reviewed by both the Working Group and the public in accordance with the requirements set out in the Section 11 Order (as amended). All comments received from the public, Working Group and Aboriginal Groups were considered when formulating the final AIR. Baseline fieldwork for all Valued Components (VCs) presented in the Application were collected during the finalization of the AIR. Rationale for the exclusion of specific VCs is presented Table 3-1 "Valued Component Selection Rationale" of the AIR.  With respect to unresolved issues, referred to in the comment, from the Working Group, BC Environmental Assessment Office has determined that the Application contains sufficient information to continue the environmental assessment process. Issues raised or further information requested during the Application review process from agencies will be addressed through various means such as technical memos, addendum, or technical meetings.  In relation to marine mammals, the effects of underwater noise on marine mammals, as a results of Project related construction and shipping, including potential residual effects of changes in behaviour, were assessed in Section 4.10. The assessment considered baseline information on marine mammals collected for this Project, as well as data collected for other potential projects in the region, the BC Cetacean Sightings Network data, and a literature review.</p>

1095	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>More comments and concerns about the Aurora LNG project: Nexen repeatedly says they are not going to study certain effects - they are just going to apply from the "appropriate regulatory body" and NOT STUDY EFFECTS. This is not an appropriate way of bypassing actual major concerns. Just because some government agency signs off and lets this project proceed does not mean that due diligence has been done!! Since this project is so close the community of Dodge Cove at 1/2 km away and only 3 km to Prince Rupert, putting both in major hazard zones if an LNG accident or malfunction happened, and also putting both in the way of all operating effects such as noise, air pollution, and water pollution, there should be no short cuts given by the government enabling this project to proceed without FULL studies in place.</p> <p>The BC government is not representing the rights and concerns of established communities of non-native origin. The BC gov't claims they are representing us and making these decisions for us. Ignoring the community of Dodge Cove's concerns is hardly representing us. Members from this community have written many letters, spoken to many BC gov't employees and leaders, held meetings with Ministers, attended conferences and availed themselves of any opportunity to bring these issues of concern to any regulating body. This has had absolutely zero effect at having the concerns of this community listened to. The BC government is expressly NOT representing us, and IGNORING OUR RIGHTS AND CONCERNS, and have NO RIGHT to make this decision for us.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies and uncertainties in public safety standards - even though international organization SIGTTO has direct safety standards that they urge governments to follow. Safety and siting need to be further studied before siting so close to human habitation.</p> <p>Where is the data that proves that this close is okay? Sandia laboratories and SIGTTO are clear with their data that this close to communities is not okay. We should not have to prove that this close is UNSAFE... it has already been proven.</p> <p>Who approves this site and on what basis? Why this site and not another site?</p> <p>"Government isn't regulating large corporations to protect public interests, health or welfare, but instead making backdoor deals with disreputable partners." Naomi Klein This accurately describes what is happening here between the BC government, the Prince Rupert Port Authority, and Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation.</p> <p>"Communities on the toxic frontlines of extractive industries." Naomi Klein This accurately describes Dodge Cove and Prince Rupert, and all the communities that will be affected in the fracking fields to extract the gas that are being told that "we understand your concerns" such as Nexen has repeatedly tried to say to Dodge Cove. Oh? You do? Is your child going to possibly get leukemia from living close to a toxic LNG terminal?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG has conducted numerous studies to address various aspects of human health as requested by provincial and federal agencies including Health Canada, Northern Health, the BC Ministry of Health, Environment Canada, and the BC Ministry of Environment. These studies have included studies on the potential effect of the Project to seafood quality, air quality, cancer rates, and social effects, among others. The results of these studies have been used to further refine the design of the Project to reduce and mitigate potential effects to the human environment.</p> <p>For example, the proposed access road has been moved further west, away from Dodge Cove, to avoid overlap with the Dodge Cove drinking water watershed. This change would protect the Dodge Cove drinking water supply from potential accidental spills along the proposed road. Mitigation measures are also proposed throughout the design of the Project to reduce noise levels and changes to the terrestrial, marine and atmospheric environments.</p> <p>With respect to the SIGTTO, Aurora LNG is of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location, is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance. The document titled Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In this regard, this guidance document does not identify exclusion zones, rather it focuses on identifying design considerations for jetty safety and presents a series of risk reduction options, which, in relation to jetty location, includes the recommendation that jetties be located away from populated areas and removed from other marine traffic and port activity. This SIGTTO guidance also promotes a flexible approach to jetty location that is focused on a localized determination based on the specific circumstances associated with the proposed facility and identifies measures (e.g. static and dynamic mooring analysis and the collection of site specific wind /wave data) that can be employed to reduce location risk.</p>
1096 (1 of 2)	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>More comments and concerns regarding the Aurora LNG project: "Carbon trading energy legislation instead of bold long-term economic planning." Naomi Klein What will the cost to this community/region be to have an emergency plan in place, this should be looked at before approval? And what exactly is the plan? The responsibility cannot be laid onto other local governments as Nexen will be the cause and the reason for needing it - needs to provide relevant data/plans/calculations regarding it.</p> <p>The port and provincial gov't is going to make \$ from taxes but municipal gov'ts are going to bear the brunt of all expenses.</p> <p>Dodge cove was not included in the list of communities to consult with at the beginning of the dAIR, and had not part in formulating the dAIR/AIR.</p> <p>Dodge cove should have been a stand-alone VC in the AIR.</p> <p>Digby Island property owners were not informed of the application for IUL or potential comment period or its impacts.</p> <p>Digby Island property owners were not informed or consulted about the IUL overlapping the Dodge Cove OCP boundaries.</p> <p>Nexen claimed the MFLNR approved it and they didn't need any local gov't's approval. Complete disregard for the regional district, local governments, existing OCP boundaries, and any local consultation.</p> <p>Nexen used local water in the IUL - in drilling process- where are the studies about the effects. are baseline data being done beforehand?</p> <p>Baseline data on migratory birds has not been done accurately by Nexen, and the disturbance to the island during Nexen's IUL does not give an accurate baseline. They studied most of the birds when the birds weren't even here - and then had major helicopter traffic happening when the birds returned.</p> <p>If water is coming from Prince Rupert (Port) there needs to be a study on all the effects on the water supply etc.</p> <p>Where is the site alternative section? There must be alternative sites to loading LNG away from human activity and the busy port?</p> <p>Cumulative effects not just now but for the next 40 years (potential licence) need a study timeline of effects for that length of time - include local/regional/national/global cumulative effects for that timeline.</p> <p>Pipeline and compressor station - effects are being kept separate from the Aurora Project, residents in Dodge Cove were not made aware at the time for public comment that the pipeline would feed Aurora (Aurora was not looking at Digby Island).</p> <p>Climate change potential effects on wind direction/water/spread of contaminants need to be studied. ESSA didn't include these effects in the recent cumulative airshed study.</p> <p>The idea of issuing a 20 or 40 year permit without resolution of all these issues/concerns.</p> <p>The land is tied up (even if no development) while they sit on it after approval, making it unusable for anything else.</p> <p>"Ensuring the communities where we operate will benefit from our presence." David Markham - Nexen What benefits is Dodge Cove supposed to feel from Nexen's presence?</p> <p>There is knowledge about the effects (50 sq km marine dead zone) and the BC gov't and CNOOC-NExen are going to mislead the public and put it in the Skeena River estuary - worst spot to put it.</p> <p>This will be trading one economy(a long term renewable resource based economy) for another (short term non-renewable resource based economy).</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project. Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. A detailed Emergency Response Plan and an Environmental Management Plan will be created, drawing on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience.</p> <p>Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships. Aurora LNG's studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks. Other expected benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•\$28 billion on construction spending and \$4.5 billion per year during operations</li> <li>•\$11 billion in tax revenues for the government of Canada during construction and operations</li> <li>•Average workforce between 2,650 and 3,000 workers with a peak workforce of 5,000 workers.</li> <li>•\$25 billion in revenue for the BC provincial government during construction and operations.</li> <li>•\$2.6 billion to the BC gross domestic product during construction and \$3.4 billion per year during operations</li> <li>•300 staff during phase 1, increasing to approximately 600 staff once the project reaches full build out</li> <li>•For every 100 direct and indirect jobs created, an estimated 36 induced jobs will be created.</li> <li>•Aurora LNG anticipates that 90% of the operational workforce (approximately 540 workers at full build out) will be Canadian residents.</li> </ul> <p>Additional consideration of issues not addressed in Part B of the Application relevant to the community of Dodge Cove is provided in Section 13.5. Issues include quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living. Assessment of a 'Dodge Cove-specific' VC was not a requirement of the AIR. Aurora LNG aspires to establish and build long-term, respectful, and mutually beneficial relationships with local communities, including the residents of Dodge Cove.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1096 (2 of 2)	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>How will this benefit communities for the long term? Naomi Klein - "In order for multinational corporations to protect their freedom to pollute the atmosphere, peasants, farmers and indigenous people are losing their freedom to live and sustain themselves in peace." This is Dodge Cove - gardeners/fishermen and renewable resource sustainability jobs - plus the freedom to live and sustain ourselves in peace. Naomi Klein - should be looking for ways to support these ways of life - not severing deep traditions of stewardship and pushing more people to become rootless urban consumers. There is a joke in Dodge Cove - except it's not funny. We will be turned into "LNG refugees". "while green groups battle over the research and "voluntary codes" oil and gas industry keep building infrastructure" Naomi Klein Where does government end and oil and gas industry begin? - naomi klein The money that perverts the political process acts as a kind of lid on the "frog in the pot" metaphor - it intercepts the survival instincts and keeps us all in the pot - naomi klein Politicians must be prohibited from receiving donations from the industry they are supposed to regulate - naomi klein Naomi Klein "there are other far more effective ways to find green development than offsetting and carbon trade (the int'l carbon market - just another market ploy.) <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=493&amp;v=CN_vbJCWT6c">https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=493&amp;v=CN_vbJCWT6c</a></p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Migratory Birds-The assessment for Wildlife Resources (Terrestrial) and Marine Birds valued components acknowledges that habitats within the PDA and LAA provide seasonal life requisites for migratory birds, including foraging, breeding, roosting, staging during migration, and wintering habitat. The scope and timing of field studies to support the characterization of existing conditions for migratory birds were scheduled to coincide with important patterns in seasonal use in accordance with Resource Inventory Standards Committee (RISC) protocols. The methods and results of field studies targeting migratory birds, and the applicable survey standards that were adhered to, are described in Appendix J and Q of the Application. Although some surveys were completed in a single season as per RISC protocols, survey effort was replicated across and within habitat types within the PDA and LAA. Results of field studies were put into context with regional datasets (e.g., BC Breeding Bird Atlas, BC Coastal Waterbird Surveys) to capture seasonal presence, abundance, and distribution of migratory birds more accurately. Collectively, these data are used to help characterize Project effects to migratory birds in Sections 4.7 and 4.11. Initial field studies were completed in late spring or early summer in 2014 and 2015, in advance of geotechnical studies that were supported by increased helicopter use between late February through December 2016. Aurora LNG adhered to the recommended disturbance setbacks for active bald eagle and heron nesting sites on Digby Island for the duration of geotechnical studies. Aurora LNG is committed to maintaining no-disturbance setbacks during project construction and operation, as per Mitigation 4.7.6. Assessment of effects regarding the use of potable and non-potable water is provided in Section 6.3.5.2. As noted, during construction, a temporary potable water treatment system will be brought in to desalinate sea water until the permanent water supply system was constructed and operational (see Section 1.2). Potable water demands during construction are estimated to be 1,125 m3/day. Any additional volumes required for activities such as dust suppression and civil works will be confirmed as Project design progresses. For early construction works (i.e., site preparation), Aurora LNG may also evaluate transporting municipal water by barge from the Prince Rupert port to the MOF, where it would be dispensed to a water storage tank. Treated water would be used for domestic uses and civil works. Untreated water would be used for general construction activities such as dust control. It is anticipated that construction activities may require one barge per day to bring municipal water to site. During operations, desalinated sea water will supply potable water, demineralized water, power plant cooling water, utility water and firewater (see Section 1.2). The total projected operational water demand for the Project at full build-out is estimated to be approximately 9,855 m3/day. Overall, demand for potable and non-potable water is not expected to outpace available supply with the implementation of mitigation measures. Assessment of a natural gas pipeline to Digby Island is outside the scope of the Project.</p>
1097	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>This report should be read by the BCEAO if it hasn't been already. A Clear Look at BC LNG Energy security, environmental implications and economic potential by David Hughes</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your comment.</p>
1098	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Dear Catherine McKenna, I have lived in the Prince Rupert and the outlying region for over 29 years, and on Digby Island for over 17 years. My child is a fourth generation Dodge Cove resident, and my husband was born in Dodge Cove. Dodge Cove is a unique coastal community that has been on Digby Island for over 100 years, just across from Prince Rupert. Digby Island is a small island, only a few miles long, with the southern area part of the Skeena River estuary zone. Dodge Cove is gravely concerned by the present CNOOC Nexen Aurora LNG proposal for 0.5 km away from our homes. Not only does this contravene international LNG best safety standards outlined by SIGTTO (which call for 2.2 miles or more from communities), but this also seems to completely stand against the commitment by B.C. to reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 2007 levels by 2050, and the commitment that Canada just made in Paris to lower emissions. The Skeena River is the 2nd largest salmon river that brings over \$100 million to our Northern economy through commercial fishing, and even more (a few billion??) through tourism. The fact that this location is being heralded as a viable option seems to be contradictory to managing our resources in an environmentally responsible way. The B.C. government seems to be struggling with their role and I do not believe that these LNG proposals should be a provincial matter but a federal one. Canadian resources need to be managed in an environmentally responsible manner, that adhere to the larger goal of reducing emissions and improving clean technology. Proper siting locations that adhere to the LNG industries best safety standards as outlined by SIGTTO should be the only ones considered. Federal environmental assessments should be done on each proposal (at present, CNOOC Nexen Aurora is only being assessed provincially) and on cumulative effects as well. This area that I live in has been livable and sustainable up to now, but these LNG terminal sites threaten our existing economy, environment, food security, and safety. CNOOC Nexen Aurora LNG says it is committed to the highest safety and health standards, yet would release close to the same amount of emissions as all the cars in B.C. into our airshed and watershed. I find it hard to believe that the "highest safety and health standards" do not protect myself, my family and my community from the CNOOC Nexen Aurora LNG proposal. The provincial government keeps stating that these projects will be built by the "best standards" yet when asked have not stated what those "best standards" are. I would like to know what "best standards" these projects must adhere to? I look forward to your reply.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG recognizes that this comment is directed to Catherine McKenna, but would like to provide the following supporting technical information. With respect to application of guidance from Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), including the Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint), and the Sandia Report entitled Guidance on Risk Analysis and Safety Implications of a Large Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Spill Over Water (2004), while these documents are not incorporated into or enforceable under any of the regulatory regimes in Canada, these type of documents are being utilized by Aurora LNG to inform its understanding of international best practices. To help companies choose potential locations for a LNG port facility and manage potential risks, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), of which the project partners are members, published a list of "general considerations" in 1997. According to SIGTTO, these considerations were meant as "basic guides to prompt special inquiry into particular aspects" (SIGTTO Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, 1997). Aurora LNG used the SIGTTO recommendations when choosing Digby Island as the site of our proposed facility. Aurora LNG also followed separate guidelines established by the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC). In choosing Digby Island as the proposed Aurora LNG site, location-specific risks were identified, these risks will undergo further assessment to determine appropriate mitigation measures as part of the engineering design phase. With respect to GHG emissions, Provincial and Federal GHG reduction commitments are impacted by numerous factors outside the scope or control of this Project. Therefore, Aurora LNG cannot comment on how BC and Canada will meet these broader commitments. Aurora LNG has identified the best practices that will be implemented during construction in Table 4.3-12 of the Application. Further, use of best achievable technologies will be incorporated into the Project design to optimize fuel efficiency and reduce potential emissions. These best practices and best achievable technologies will be included in the GHG Management Plan that will be prepared following Project approval. Aurora LNG recognizes the importance of the Skeena River as a major salmon habitat and economic driver supporting the local commercial, recreational and aboriginal (CRA) fisheries. To assess potential effects of the project on marine fish and, in turn, local fisheries, extensive field surveys on marine fish and fish habitat were conducted and used to support the assessment of potential Project effects on marine fish and fish habitat (Section 4.9) and marine use (Section 6.5.). Results of the assessment indicate that with the application of relevant mitigation measures and the implementation of a DFO approved fisheries offsetting plan there is no predicted significant effect on CRA fish. The Application also considers potential effects on the economy (Section 5.0), food security (Section 6.6), tourism (Sections 5.0, 6.4 and 6.5), safety (Section 9.0) and air quality (Section 4.2). Potential effects of the Project on human health as a result of changes to the quality of air, water and harvested food are considered in Section 8.0.</p>

1099	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>The Honourable Marc Garneau, P.C., M.P. Minister of Transport January 24th, 2016 Dear Marc Garneau,</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking the time to come to Prince Rupert recently. I hope you are able to return another time and meet with a wider proportion of local representatives.</p> <p>I am a long time resident of Dodge Cove, Digby Island. Digby Island played a pivotal role in national security, defending the Prince Rupert Harbour and Canada during the 2nd World War. Submarine nets crossed the main channel and lookouts, guns, and soldiers were stationed in many places on Digby Island. Now, Digby Island has both the Prince Rupert Airport, the community of Dodge Cove, and other residential homes.</p> <p>I am very concerned by the proposal of CNOOC Nexen to place the Aurora LNG export terminal at the mouth of Prince Rupert Harbour, on Digby Island. The Aurora LNG proposal seems to be in complete contradiction to all terminal siting safety standards as laid out by SIGTTO, the U.S. Department of Energy and studies done by Sandia Laboratories. SIGTTO states "that LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses now and into the future...long narrow inland waterways are to be avoided...conflicted waterway uses include fishing and recreational boating..."</p> <p>Prince Rupert Harbour has over 1000 large ships every year such as cruise ships, ferries and tankers entering and exiting through the mouth of Prince Rupert harbour. Between April and November, 7000 of other marine vessel traffic was counted such as commercial and fishing vessels, recreational, coast guard, RCMP, and other services as they enter and exit Prince Rupert Harbour. These numbers will only be increasing with the current container port expansion and future expansion plans. All the other marine traffic would need to be held up for hours each day with LNG tankers transiting the mouth of the Prince Rupert Harbour, or they would be in the LNG tanker Hazard Zone. All vessels are considered to be an ignition source.</p> <p>The CNOOC Nexen Aurora LNG terminal would be built right in the path of all the airplanes flying in and out of Prince Rupert daily. They actually have a plan to extend the runways even further down the island and increase the airplane traffic.</p> <p>"If an aircraft crashed into an LNG facility, the impact would almost certainly cause a fire fueled initially by the aircraft fuel. It may also ignite the LNG, causing a larger fire at the facility...Danger to the public from this type of event would be reduced or eliminated by the separation distance of the facility." The Center for Energy Economics (U.S.)</p> <p>Four Critical Safety Conditions are used when determining LNG terminal sites, the fourth condition being SEPERATION DISTANCE. As other countries are also very concerned about LNG terminals and tankers in relation to terrorist threats, we need to be as well. The proposed location for this terminal seems to be checking off the list of where NOT to place LNG terminals: at the mouth of the harbour with significant marine traffic, in the flight path by an airport, 0.5 km to the closest community and only 3 km to Prince Rupert.</p> <p>CNOOC Nexen Aurora is only one of many proposals for the Prince Rupert Harbour which is not following international best safety standards. I strongly urge for the Canadian government to adopt the SIGTTO safety standards as new regulation.</p> <p>Since this proposed site is in complete contradiction to international LNG industries own best practices, what are the Federal standards and best practices when it comes to potentially dangerous projects such as this one? I look forward to your reply.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1100 (1 of 2)	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>(letter sent to Provincial gov't)To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I have lived in this area for 29 years, and on Digby Island for over 17 years. I am presently raising a 4th generation Dodge Cove resident. I choose to live in Dodge Cove because it is rural living close to nature that has quiet, fresh air, clean water, food harvesting and hunting and fishing. This is a unique coastal community that has been here for over 100 years.</p> <p>The Nexen LNG proposal for Digby Island is going to drastically change all these reasons that I live here, with the change in the quality of my air and water supply, the noise and light that will be emitted through any construction stages and while the terminal operates, and the loss of my traditional food gathering areas. Already my life has changed as my family struggles with the increased air traffic noise and activity in what has always been our nature space, trails for hiking and food related activities, as the site evaluation for this proposed LNG terminal is carried out. The noise and activity has been loud and is bothersome as well as affecting the animals and birds, many of which are species of conservation concern.</p> <p>There are many reasons that an LNG export terminal should not be placed on Digby Island. Yet the main reason that concerns me is how close this terminal will be (1/2 km) to our community of Dodge Cove.</p> <p>International LNG industry standards have 4 CRITICAL SAFETY CONDITIONS that are used when determining the terminal sites.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Primary Containment</li> <li>2) Secondary Containment</li> <li>3) Safeguard Systems</li> <li>4) SEPERATION DISTANCE</li> </ol> <p>LNG facility designs are required by regulation to maintain seperation distances to land-based facilities from communities and other public areas. Safe zones are also required around LNG ships.</p> <p>In the event of an accidental release of LNG, the safety zone around a facility or ship protects surrounding communities and public areas from personal injury, property damage, or fire.</p> <p>SIGTTO - the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators - recommends that terminals are sited a minimum of 2.2 miles from any community or marine navigation zone, and urge for a minimum of 3 miles.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this Digby Island location for an LNG terminal. This location does not adhere to international LNG terminal siting regulations. As these regulations are in place to protect citizens as well as the entire LNG industry, they need to be followed.</p> <p>Nexen Aurora LNG says that they are committed to the highest safety and health standards for the public. If that truly is the case, then the Digby Island location is not viable for an LNG terminal.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Siting: With respect to safety and facility siting, Aurora LNG confirms that it intends to comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require an LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations.</p> <p>SIGTTO: With respect to the SIGTTO, the document entitled Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In this regard, this guidance document does not identify exclusion zones, rather it focuses on identifying design considerations for jetty safety and presents a series of risk reduction options, which, in relation to jetty location, includes the recommendation that jetties be located away from populated areas and removed from other marine traffic and port activity. This SIGTTO guidance also promotes a flexible approach to jetty location that is focused on a localized determination based on the specific circumstances associated with the proposed facility and identifies measures (e.g. static and dynamic mooring analysis and the collection of site specific wind /wave data) that can be employed to reduce location risk. Aurora LNG is therefore of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance.</p> <p>Quality of Life/Community Identity and Social Cohesion: Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could potentially affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is predicted.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>

1100 (2 of 2)	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones. Outstanding community concerns regarding changes to perceived quality of life may continue, despite the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce potential Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>Human Health – Air Quality, Noise, and Drinking Water: Assessed in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and noted in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application), the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically:</p> <p>1) Air Quality - The concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people).</p> <p>2) Noise - The predicted levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</p> <p>3) Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</p> <p>For information on accidents and malfunctions please refer to Section 9 of the Application.</p>
1101	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>I have concerns that the effects to the entire Skeena River are not being looked at, and the effects up and down the coast that will result in the proposed major disturbance of situating the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG terminal right in critical marine habitat.</p> <p>Delusion Bay on Digby Island is a highly valuable habitat for many fish species, which in turn support the marine mammals, birds and other species of which the marine life is a critical part of the food web.</p> <p>Study of Skeena River Estuary Juvenile Salmon Habitat "The southwest shore of Lelu Island and Delusion Bay (south end of Digby Island) are highly valuable habitats for neritic feeding species (e.g., Coho, sockeye, and steelhead)."</p> <p>Page vi</p> <p><a href="http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf">http://skeenawild.org/images/uploads/docs/Skeena_River_Estuary_Juvenile_Salmon_Habitat.pdf</a></p> <p>"...estuaries provide essential nursery and juvenile rearing habitats, with up to 80% of coastal wildlife species relying on estuaries during at least one stage of their life history (BCMOE 2006)"</p> <p>As this report goes into great detail of habitat suitability - why the Skeena River Estuary is important for fish habitat, and the role that Delusion Bay and the south end of Digby Island plays in habitat for fish, I would hope that all the maps, information, and studies will be looked at. It seems to be contradictory to many of the findings of CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG in their Final Application.</p> <p>"High levels of sediment and turbidity can reduce water quality in the estuary. Both of these conditions may affect the growth of eelgrass beds, the availability of food, and the survival of juvenile salmon."</p> <p>"Filling, diking, dredging, and infrastructure development can damage or alter important nearshore or estuarine habitat, including riparian vegetation and eelgrass beds. Early marine survival of wild salmon depends on sheltered, intact coastal habitats as well as abundant food resources found in these habitats."</p> <p>"Local shoreline development can lead to temporary or permanent loss of estuarine intertidal wetlands, which are an important nearshore habitat for juvenile salmon."</p> <p><a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/libraryfiles/lib_432.pdf">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/libraryfiles/lib_432.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_433/">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_433/</a></p> <p><a href="http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_434/">http://skeenasalmonprogram.ca/library/lib_434/</a></p> <p>All the maps, information, and extended data related to this report highlights the importance of the south end of Digby Island and the Skeena Estuary. It highlights the importance of chlorophyll, algae, eelgrass etc. In this specific area. It highlights the sensitivity of this area to industrial activity. These need to be studied, as they seem to contradict many of the assumptions that Aurora LNG has made about the south end of Digby Island.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the comment and agrees that the Skeena River estuary has high ecological value, particularly in relation to Pacific salmon. The commenter's statement that the Skeena River estuary is important for fish habitat aligns with Aurora LNG's findings. The Marine Fish and Fish Habitat TDR (Appendix L) explicitly discusses the presence and value of, among other habitats, marine intertidal and subtidal habitat, estuarine marsh and meadow, eelgrass and kelp. The TDR discusses Chatham Sound's status as an Ecologically and Biologically Significant Area, and the presence of DFO designated Important Areas near the Project, including habitats for Pacific herring, Pollock and eulachon. The locations of nearby rockfish conservation areas are also noted. The importance of the Skeena River estuary for juvenile Pacific salmon is also explicitly discussed (Section 4.2.3.1 of Appendix L).</p> <p>The ecological value of South Digby Island and Delusion Bay are also specifically noted in the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat TDR (Appendix L). The rich biodiversity associated with highly productive kelp beds and rocky habitat around South Digby Island are a clear observation from field surveys. For example, from the Executive Summary (page iii, Appendix L) "Numerous species of marine vegetation and algae were observed in the intertidal and subtidal zones of South Digby Island, including native eelgrass, surfgrass (Phyllospadix spp.) and understory and canopy-forming kelps." It goes on to further describe the eelgrass areas and the many species that associate with these areas. Likewise, the eelgrass areas and estuarine meadows within Delusion Bay are detailed and fully recognized: "Shiner perch (Cymatogaster aggregate), flatfish, and sculpin (Family Cottidae) were captured by beach seine...Marine fish species observed in beach seine catches include juveniles belonging to all five species of Pacific salmon, as well as surf smelt, starry flounder, Dolly Varden and unidentified larval fish...among others". These rich, ecologically important habitats are considered not only in the Environmental Assessment proper (Section 4.9.5.2, specifically), but also in the associated Conceptual Fish Habitat Offsetting Plan (Appendix V). Aurora LNG therefore believes that the ecological value of South Digby Island, including Delusion Bay, are noted and duly incorporated into the Environmental Assessment. The information provided by the commenter does not contradict the information that Aurora LNG has provided for the south end of Digby Island.</p>
1102	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Prince George, British Columbia	<p>LNG on the NW coast is extremely irresponsible and shortsighted. Damage cannot be undone.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1103	2017-03-08	Emily Hoffpauir - Victoria, British Columbia	<p>Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.</p> <p>This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.</p> <p>Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1104	2017-03-08	mark mc myn - Terrace, British Columbia	<p>Keep your filthy lng project out of the north.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

1105	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Okotoks, Alberta	<p>Please provide clarification on how existing marine-based air emission rates were established within the regional assessment area (RAA). The Environmental Assessment Certificate Application, Appendix A - 'Air Quality Technical Data Report', references version 4.1 of the Marine Emission Inventory Tool (MEIT) as the source of marine vessel emission rates. It states that marine-based air emission levels from 2010 were forecasted to 2015 in the MEIT for the 2010 National Marine Emissions Inventory for Canada (SNC Lavalin, 2012b). The 2010 emission inventory report acknowledges uncertainty in the west coast emission estimates on page ES-4:</p> <p>"The Canadian Coast Guard VTOSS data was found to be inferior to INNAV for purposes of marine inventory development. For this reason, the emission estimates for the west coast are considered to have higher uncertainty than estimates for the east coast. The INNAV system is now being used by the Coast Guard on the west coast (as of 2011) and will be available for future marine emission studies."</p> <p>The conclusion section of the same report includes suggested actions for future improvements to the MEIT and Canada's national marine emission inventory including:</p> <p>"Evaluation of the west coast inventory by acquiring and using 2011 INNAV data in MEIT V4.0."</p> <p>Was the higher quality INNAV activity data added to the MEIT for the purposes of this Environmental Assessment?</p> <p>A document posted on the EAO web site on March 7, 2017, 'MEIT User Guide V4.3 March 20, 2015.pdf' includes a model history section (Table 1-1, page 3) that lists version 4.3, March 2015 as the most recent version of the MEIT. However, another file posted on the EAO web site, 'Updated Tables_MEIT 4.3.1' includes tables of west coast marine emission estimates sourced from "Excerpt from MEIT Update 4.3.1 (by ECCC)". For transparency, please clarify which version of the MEIT was used as the source for the emission levels presented in the application and the source of the MEIT marine vessel activity data for the west coast (VTOSS, INNAV, others...). From this version of the MEIT, please provide reports in Excel spreadsheet format (and/or Excel pivot table format as mentioned in the User Guide) that show the emission levels used in the Environmental Assessment Application. Please also include a list of assumptions including if 100% compliance or partial compliance was assumed with the Emission Control Area (ECA) sulphur fuel standard and the IMO Tiered NOx emission standards for marine vessels operating within the ECA.</p> <p>Thank-you,</p>	<p>Please see the "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO. The "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to the Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo was presented to the Working Group in draft for pre-read on April 17, 2017 under the title of "Air Quality Figures, Datasets and a Comparison to PRAS."</p>
1106	2017-03-08	Fred Millar - Arlington VA USA	See attached memo	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigation measures to further reduce the potential for incidents.</p>
1107	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	Stop the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project. This community and the natural environment have too much to lose. It is time to move towards renewable sources of energy. Get with the program BC.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1108	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	Together with the Tsimshian people, the Digby Island community, our oceans, salmon, and forests who cannot speak for themselves, I say a loud, strong NO to the Aurora LNG project. It is not in the best interests of BC to pursue a dying industry at the expense of our invaluable land and waters. Now is the time to be investing in renewable sources of energy instead of an LNG facility that puts innumerable wildlife and ocean communities at risk.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1109	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Madeira park	I grew up on Digby Island in Crippen Cove, it's always going to be home and is heartbreaking to hear what the proposed LNG plant is going to be doing to the island and the neighbouring community of Dodge Cove. There's expensive wild and rugged coast lines that are greatly untouched, and species of animals that will be affected by this. Growing up there was always a multitude of sea life to find along the beaches and in the tidal pools. After living in Vancouver I'm. Shocked by how much the human effect has had on the coasts down here, it's hard to find much of any life along the shores here. Please don't do the same thing up there, invest in something more sustainable and long term with less of an environmental impact. This isn't worth it.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1110	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Surge Narrows	the proposed facility would be too close to the city and would endanger too many other aspects of life in the surrounding area. I submit that this would be a terrible place to build the proposed facility. River estuaries need to be protected from this sort of development.	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our JV partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigations to further reduce the potential for any incidents. We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1111	2017-03-08	Zack - Digby island, British Columbia	I've called digby island home for almost 30 years, it's where I grew up with my little sister and parents. Our days consisted of long beach walks and digging clams when the tide was low and kayaking and fishing near the shore when it was high. I think to go ahead with the LNG request would be an extremely bad move for Digby island's Eco-system as well as the residents. The muskeg and marsh lands are home to a huge variety of animals and flora, which I believe would be negatively impacted by large scale construction. As for the residents we live on an island to be away from exactly this sort of thing, it's all about being in the outdoors without abunch of man made buildings. As a closing statement I'd like to bring up the next generation of kids on digby, I would like my future children to be able to grow up like I did, in a pristine wilderness surrounded by the ocean. Thanks for reading and I hope you take this into consideration for your decision.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1112	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Comox, British Columbia	This does not make sense ! No to LNG	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.



1113	2017-03-08	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I would like to voice my opposition to the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project.</p> <p>The issue I have with the project is the irreversible damage being done to our beautiful country by pursuing dirty energy. Another gorgeous part of Canada will be no more, and why? Because of the gas &amp; oil industry working together with the government to profit from getting every last drop of oil from our land.</p> <p>In particular to the LNG industry, I have always been confused by the apparent glee and positive spin the LNG industry positions itself. They are not defenders of the environment, and environmental regulations only reduce the profits being made by these industries. LNG standards currently recommend that LNG facilities be at least 3.5km away from any community. This is a minimum recommendation, and it will immediately be rejected if this project is allowed to proceed! Dodge Cove is only 0.5km away from the facilities, and even Prince Rupert is only 3km away! How can their be trust and good faith when recommendations within their own industry are already being ignored!</p> <p>LNG involves fracking, which has been proven by science to cause extensive damage to the environment, and there is also the unknown in regard to the long-term effects of the fracking process. The time to transition to renewable energies was yesterday, but we definitely need to do it today. This is where the government needs to step in and start protecting the environment, instead of allowing it to fall apart before our eyes, so a very few individuals benefit - and in the end, do they even benefit? There are jobs in the renewable energy sector as well!</p> <p>I have been living on the Pacific Northcoast for 10 years, and I would hate to see this beautiful part of Canada be destroyed by an industry that will only be around for another 30 years, and then? The LNG industry does not profit from transitioning to renewable energies. This is where we need to have responsible governments to protect our land and people. I only see lip service being paid to truly protecting the environment, and I hope I will be proven wrong.</p> <p>There are many other social, health and heritage concerns; and I certainly hope we as a country become leaders, instead of destroyers, when it comes to turning the tables on the damage we have done to our environment. Thank you for allowing me to contribute to this discussion.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse Project effects, including on residents of Prince Rupert, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Baseline information and effect assessments for bio-physical valued components (i.e., Air Quality, Greenhouses Gases, Acoustic Environment, Water Quality, Vegetation and Wetland Resources, Wildlife Resources [Terrestrial], Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat, and Marine Wildlife) are provided in Sections 4.2 through 4.10, respectively. Baseline information and effect assessment for economic and social valued components (i.e., Economic Conditions, Visual Quality, Infrastructure and Services, Land and Resource Use, Marine Use and Navigable Waters, and Community Health) are provided in Sections 5.2 and 6.2 through 6.6 respectively. Baseline information and effect assessments for heritage and health valued components (i.e., Archaeological and Heritage Resources and Human Health) are provided in Sections 7.2 and 8.1 respectively. Adverse effects resulting from accidents and malfunctions are presented in Section 9.0.</p>
1114	2017-03-09	P.W.Bailey - Saanich, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Given the unrelenting pursuit of a share of the projected profit and returns within the Global LNG Market, the interdiction of The Provincial Liberal Government of British Columbia, on behalf of the People of the Province of British Columbia does not reflect the mandate to which they were elected to govern and protect the Province of British Columbia.</p> <p>Therefore, for this reason alone, the proposal to support, enhance, and develop LNG within the Province of British Columbia contradicts the reason for the election of the BC Liberals into government and must be denied.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, P.W.Bailey</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern however will defer the comment to EAO for response.</p>
1115	2017-03-09	Marlene E. Simmons - Victoria, British Columbia	<p>British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office CC: Premier Christy Clark, Minister of Environment Mary Polak, Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman RE: Comment on Aurora LNG</p> <p>Putting a facility like this right next to the historic community of Dodge Cove will massively disrupt the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Aurora LNG violates international siting standards which require such projects to be located away from population centres and other marine traffic.</p> <p>Noise from the tankers and facility would have a significant adverse impact on the harbour porpoise, a species of special concern in British Columbia.</p> <p>Digby Island lies in a Nationally Significant Important Bird Area, and great blue herons have a nesting colony on the island.</p> <p>This facility and upstream development would produce 15 megatonnes of carbon pollution every year, while the gas shipped to Asia would release another 69 MT.</p> <p>Aurora LNG would make it impossible for BC to meet its legislated climate targets and is at odds with both national and international efforts to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to put our coast, our communities and our climate at risk!</p> <p>Marlene E. Simmons Victoria, British Columbia</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1116	2017-03-09	Christine Malaka - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>The most important consideration in the proposed project of Aurora LNG on Digby Island is the destruction of critical fisheries habitat.</p> <p>It is insane that this location has been allowed to be proposed and it cannot be approved. It is a studied and known fact that this is critical habitat and it must not be compromised. Any degree of impact is not acceptable when you consider all the consequences.</p> <p>There are numerous other reasons why the project cannot be approved including the close proximity to communities and the unacceptable emission of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>As a local resident I completely oppose this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christine Malaka, Prince Rupert cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1117	2017-03-09	Kate Snyder - Smithers, British Columbia	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>I am opposed to the Auroa LNG plant planned for Digby Island. A LNG plant in this part of the Skeena River system would be extremely hazardous to the salmon and steelhead fish that migrate through. The CO2 emissions would put BC over the allowed limit. It would be dangerous to the residents of the island. It isn't worth the environmental and social damage to build the plant. The profits will leave Canada and we will have wrecked the salmon runs forever.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kate Snyder, Smithers cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

1118	2017-03-09	Donna Carr, M.D., - Encinitas	<p>Dear EAO,</p> <p>Aurora LNG threatens community health and safety! The plant would pollute the pristine air, drinking water and soil of local communities. Construction blasting and drilling and 24/7 operation of the plant and associated infrastructure would create significant impacts from noise, light, air and water pollution, degrading wildlife areas and quality of life for residents. A 2015 survey showed that 96 per cent of Dodge Cove residents were opposed to the project.</p> <p>The plant would be built less than a kilometre from the historic community of Dodge Cove, violating international siting standards. The entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour is a hazardous narrow channel with strong tidal currents and severe winter storms. This raises the potential for collisions, grounding of vessels and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures.</p> <p>The proposed site is within Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala Traditional Territories. For millennia, these First Nations have relied on the area for fishing and food harvesting. A report prepared for the Gitxaala Nation showed the project poses direct risks to food security, fisheries, community health and cultural heritage. As a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada must obtain free, prior and informed consent from First Nations before approving the project. If it can't demonstrate this, the project should not be approved. The world is watching!</p> <p>Sincerely, Donna Carr, M.D., Encinitas cc: The Honourable Christy Clark, The Honourable Mary Polak, The Honourable Rich Coleman</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern. As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined all potentially adverse effects of the project, including but not limited to: marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air, water and visual quality; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, the potential project effects were found to be not significant with the implementation of planned mitigation measures. Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment to ensure the potential effects of the Project were not underestimated. As outlined in the application, Delusion Bay is expected to remain largely undisturbed and dredge activities are limited to areas off of Frederick Point and Casey Cove. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan (currently being developed) will include details on the potential effects to fish and fish habitat including salmon and the proposed offset to meet the DFO requirement of no net loss. Regarding potential effects to wildlife, Aurora LNG will fully comply with the 11 different pieces of government legislation, policy and regulatory guidance in place to protect wildlife, and we have also identified 23 mitigation measures that we will implement to further reduce potential wildlife effects. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>Our proposed facility will be located in a busy commercial harbour and along a well-established commercial shipping route. When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create risk management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Since project inception, we've been building relationships with all local stakeholders and have had over 130 meetings with First Nations and Aboriginal groups including Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala. Representatives from each of these First Nations are members of our provincially appointed working group, and we look forward to continuing our regular engagement with them.</p>
1119	2017-03-09	Evelyne Meynen - Hedley, former Prince Rupert	<p>I lived in Rupert for a while and my sister has had a home on Digby for over 20 years. I have walked this beautiful natural area many times over the years. In my opinion this is such an inappropriate spot to put up any sort of industrial complex. It would ruin the peaceful, pristine wonder of this area.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1120 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Dr Margaret McGregor, Dr Larry Barzelai, Amy Lubic - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p>As BC members of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment (CAPE), we are submitting our concerns about the potential negative health impacts of the Aurora LNG Digby proposal in the attached letter.</p> <p>March 7th, 2017 Environmental Assessment Office Government of British Columbia</p> <p>We are BC members of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment (CAPE), a national organization whose mandate is to educate and advocate for a safe and healthy environment (<a href="http://cape.ca/">http://cape.ca/</a>).</p> <p>We are writing to express our concerns with the Aurora (LNG) Project due to its unexamined and potentially significant adverse effects on human health. These effects are both as a consequence of the project's contribution to climate change, and as result of the local health implications of hydraulic fracturing operations.</p> <p>The Aurora project, in our opinion, contradicts the spirit and terms of the Paris Agreement which the need to protect the "right to health" and hold the increase in average global surface temperatures well below 2 degree C(1). Indeed, the World Health Organization(WHO) calls climate change the "greatest threat to global health Of the 21 st century(2)". WHO has estimated that, between 2030 and 2050, at least 250,000 additional people worldwide die prematurely as a result of climate change from malnutrition, heat stress, diarrhea and malaria alone(3).</p> <p>Canadians are already experiencing health impacts of climate change with an increase in severe wildfires and consequent respiratory health burden(4, 5) and stressful evacuations(6); an increased spread of Lyme disease(7), and mental health and food impacts secondary to rapid landscape changes in Canada's rapidly-warming arctic regions(S), amongst other impacts. Worldwide, additional impacts include the contribution of climate-related drought to the conflict in Syria(9) with its consequent disastrous loss of life and challenging international refugee flows. As warming accelerates beyond the 2 degree C target, basic human needs will increasingly not be met, and health systems themselves will be affected(10). We cannot afford not to meet our climate targets.</p> <p>BC's 2050 target for the entire economy is 13 million tons of CO2. It is estimated that the Aurora project could consume 6.7 million tons of CO2 representing 52% of BC's 2050 carbon budget. The project would therefore prevent BC from taking advantage of what the most internationally respected medical journal, the Lancet calls the greatest health opportunity of our time—tackling climate change(10).</p> <p>[n addition, there is growing evidence of significant negative health impacts associated with hydraulic fracturing. This field of study has been transformed over the past 3 years where over 80% of the peer-reviewed scientific studies published since January 1st 2013, and the vast majority contain red flags(13). A recent systematic review of the scientific literature (2009-2015) concluded that; "84% of public health studies contain findings that indicate public health elevated risks, or adverse health of water quality studies contain findings that indicate potential, positive association, or actual incidence of water and of air quality studies contain findings that indicate elevated air pollutant emissions atmospheric concentrations.(13)" Specific concerns include the endocrine disrupting properties of fracking fluids (14), potential impacts on the development of fetuses (increased rates among those live near operations(16), contamination of groundwater resources(17) and greater risk of childhood leukemia (18).</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges this comment. Provincial and Federal GHG reduction commitments are impacted by numerous factors outside of the scope and control of the Aurora LNG Project. Therefore, Aurora LNG cannot comment on if, or how, BC and Canada will meet these broader commitments. LNG in BC has been identified by Provincial Regulators to be a viable transitional fuel, meaning it can help reduce global carbon emissions by replacing other more carbon-heavy fuels (coal and oil) while powering the global shift towards renewable energy. Therefore, advancements in BC LNG can assist global commitments in reducing CO2e emissions.</p>

1120 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Dr Margaret McGregor, Dr Larry Barzelai, Amy Lubic - Vancouver, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Other concerns include the proximity of the project to Dodge Cove and the traditional territories of several first nations (Metlakatla, Lax Kw'alaams and Gitxaala) where a vessel grounding, tank rupture, or other type of spill would have devastating effects.</p> <p>New information about health risks related to hydraulic fracturing has not been adequately communicated to stakeholders or incorporated into the public conversation around hydraulic fracturing and LNG in BC. Opinion surveys consistently show that health is a top concern of British Columbians. We therefore urge the commission to reject the proposal until a full health-impact assessment, including the health impact of greenhouse gas emissions on climate change, has been completed.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Dr Margaret McGregor, (mgret@mail.ubc.ca)  Dr Tarry Barzelai barzelai@mail.ubc.ca , and  Amy Lubic (amy.anne.lubic@gmail.com)  BC members of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment</p> <p>References:  1. Nations U. Paris 2015. <a href="http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf">http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf</a>  2. Chan M. World Health Call to Action on Climate Change. 2015. <a href="http://www.who.int/globalchange/global-campaign/coo21/en/">http://www.who.int/globalchange/global-campaign/coo21/en/</a>  3. Organisation WH. Fact Sheet Climate Change and Health. 2016.  4. D. Copes R, Fisk R, Joy R, Chan K, Brauer M. Population health effects of air quality changes due to forest fires in British Columbia in 2003: estimates from physician-visit billing data. Canadian journal of public health  to forest fires in British Columbia. 2003: estimates from physician visit billing data. Canadian journal of public health  Revue de Sante publique, S. Bracer M, Macnab YC, Kennedy SM. Three measures of forest fire exposure and their associations with respiratory health outcomes in a population-based Environmental health perspectives.  S. Bell D, Children feeling stress of McMurray wildfires, 2014</p>	
1121	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - British Columbia	Way too close to communities!!!	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1122	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I am in strong opposition of the proposed Aurora LNG project on Digby Island. The close proximity of this site to the residents of Dodge Cove, the potential for contamination of their drinking water source, and the unknown health impacts of living so close to an LNG facility of this size are all too high a risk to take. During the open house held in Prince Rupert there were several questions I had that the staff were unable to answer for me. These included providing the predicted number of Canadian jobs that the project would create during the construction phase, what criteria were used to determine the impact on the Dodge Cove viewscape, and how they defined the term significant.</p> <p>While the representatives of the project were able to give numbers on estimated total workforce during the construction phase, they could not say how many of those jobs would go to trained Canadians. This is an issue, as many of those who support LNG projects like this, do so because they believe it will bring more jobs to Canadians, and they feel it is worth the environmental impacts caused by the project if it creates well paying jobs. I believe without an estimate on the number of Canadian jobs created during construction, it is impossible to make that determination, and the public is left to make a decision based on a lack of proper information.</p> <p>During the open house, it was stated that the project would be minimally visible from the Community of Dodge Cove, however this statement is incorrect. The project footprint covers over half of the waterfront in Marine Bay, adjacent to Casey Cove, and both of these locations are a part of the Dodge Cove Community. To say that a material offloading facility located in a bay which is used heavily by the residents of Dodge Cove is minimally visible is ludicrous. Furthermore, the proposed method in which the viewscape will be protected involves the use of vegetation which will clearly not grow on Digby Island. The area is a natural bog and is not at all conducive to the growth of large trees unless planted in specific locations. This project will have a detrimental impact on the visual quality of the community and destroy the ability of the community to use Marine Bay as a gathering place like they have done for generations.</p> <p>Finally, there was a lot of use of the term significant and insignificant, yet nowhere on any of the displayed material was this term defined. This term has many different definitions depending on how you approach it, and unless this term is prominently displayed and defined for the public to understand, it is a useless statement to say something is not a significant impact.</p> <p>In conclusion, I oppose this project in this location, and believe it should not be granting approval for the above reasons.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project.</p> <p>Employment: Estimates for Canadian employment are provided in Section 1.4 of the Project Application. Aurora LNG estimates that 80% of the construction workforce will be Canadian, representing 17,200 person-years (PYs) of employment. Of this, an estimated 6,600 PYs of employment will be by BC residents, and 1,100 PYs by residents of northwest BC. Aurora LNG estimates that 90% of its operational workforce (540 workers) will be Canadians, the majority of who will reside in communities in northwest BC.</p> <p>Visual Quality: Aurora LNG has prepared a supplemental technical memo titled "Additional Visual Quality Renderings", which includes a rendering of the Project from the north shore of Casey Cove. The memo also discusses potential visual quality effects of proposed dredging in Casey Cove. The technical memo will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>Dodge Cove Drinking Water Supply: Regarding the potential for effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water supply, Aurora LNG has provided a revised right-of-way for the proposed access road that does not overlap with the Dodge Cove watershed that drains into the community drinking water reservoir. The revised access road that is proposed is also separated from Dodge Cove by an elevated ridge and trees to reduce the potential effects of vehicle noise to the Dodge Cove community. Additional technical details regarding the Dodge Cove drinking water supply are described in the technical memo "Dodge Cove Water Supply and Watershed", which will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>Significance: An effect is considered "significant" if it is considered to be "not acceptable after application of proposed mitigation and compliance with all regulatory requirements and permitting conditions". A variety of thresholds for significance were used in the Aurora LNG Application. Some are related to quality and sustainability of environmental components. Others refer to specific regulatory thresholds (e.g. noise or water quality standards), or qualitative standards. The thresholds for significance are included for each VC assessment.</p>

1123	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>There is this idea that the LNG projects proposed for BC are for the "greater good" of our country. Yet we only need to look at Australia, or Scotland, and other countries that have reaped very little benefits from the oil and gas industry due to low tax incentives to encourage companies to build, and look at the debt of these projects and the burden that is placed on the average person, to know that this should not be a goal for our country.</p> <p>These are finite non-renewable resources that belong to all Canadian citizens, that the gov't is essentially hired to manage. If this was an actual company, the decision makers (making these bad back-door deals that are giving our product away with such little benefit to the citizens of this country) would be fired.</p> <p>"The court (in the U.S.) wrote that the public was not the "primary and paramount" beneficiary (of oil and gas pipelines), as the state had claimed.</p> <p>"advances the proposition that (the pipelines taking over peoples' property) somehow will advance the development of infrastructure of the Commonwealth. Such a projected benefit is speculative, and, in any event, would be merely an incidental one," wrote Justice Debra McCloskey Todd for the majority.</p> <p>"Mere economic benefit is not enough," said Bomstein. "Right now in Pennsylvania nobody is starving from lack of ethane. Nobody is crying in the streets for more butane. There is no apparent public need for these things and that's demonstrated by the fact that [the gas products] are being exported."</p> <p>Once a company such as CNOOC-Nexen receives an approval for a project such as Aurora LNG, it's essentially a blank check to develop its infrastructure. With all variables to be "worked out with the agencies necessary" instead of putting those plans forward for public review. With such impact to local communities such as Dodge Cove, such decisions made by shady political leaders who are under intense scrutiny for their oil and gas industry connections and money-taking, and such a lack of benefit to this country, projects such as CNOOC-Nexens' Aurora LNG need to be told NO. Nobody is crying in the streets of Canada for more LNG to supply ourselves, but if it is drained from Canada, in the future that may very well be the case.</p> <p>"Eminent domain attorney Rich Raiders, who represents a number of landowners who have cases with Sunoco, says his clients feel left in the dark on these decisions, and that the deck is stacked against them and in favor of pipeline operators."</p> <p><a href="https://stateimpact.npr.org/pennsylvania/2016/10/31/a-new-front-emerges-in-the-battle-against-eminant-domain/">https://stateimpact.npr.org/pennsylvania/2016/10/31/a-new-front-emerges-in-the-battle-against-eminant-domain/</a></p> <p>Problems in Scotland with the oil and gas industry will most likely be the same in Canada. Overwhelmingly in the last 15 years we have seen the capture and increasing control of Canada by the oil and gas industry, of which there are many reports and data if one chooses to search for it. How are any of these issues different here? How are any of these issues studied in the Aurora LNG application, and by the Federal and Provincial governments of Canada? The avoidance of health standards, regulations, and requests for information from the Canadian government is clear throughout this entire EA process, and CNOOC-Nexen has done its best to make it look like the impacts will be minimal, when the reality is the impacts will be devastating on so many levels (that aren't even written into the AIR). " the oil companies are failing to provide full benefit to the people of Scotland", The North Sea has been devastated by almost 45 years of oil exploitation with damage caused not only by disasters (such as the Braer grounding in 1993 luckily rough weather dispersed much of the oil spill) and oil slicks (which often go unreported) but also by the impact of everyday operations. This includes seismic ships setting off underwater explosions, drill cuttings being dumped on the sea bed, rigs and pipelines being coated in toxic chemicals, and the noise and light pollution of gas flaring. In recent years, Shell and BP have also moved into the pristine deep water of the Atlantic Frontier, host to enormous biodiversity including whales, dolphins and porpoises. The effects of exploration on these poorly understood ecologies could be devastating. (Aberdeen) because of its reliance on the oil industry it would be very vulnerable to a price slump, or to oil companies moving out to more competitive locations.</p> <p>Working in the oil industry is a precarious business, not just with the effects of climate change and the 'maturing' (i.e. 'running out') of the North Sea oil fields, but also with companies cutting jobs, casualising labour and very real health and safety issues. Besides, with the rapid advance of technology, there are now several unmanned rigs in the North Sea.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concern. Aurora LNG provided a robust environmental assessment based on a conservative approach and regulatory guidance, where the potential effects of the Project have been described transparently and have not been underestimated. Furthermore, Aurora LNG believe that the environmental assessment provides sufficient and accurate baseline and effects assessment information to enable the BC Environmental Assessment Office and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to make a well informed decision towards the approval process.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to evaluate and learn from other LNG Projects such as those in Scotland and Australia. Aurora LNG is committed to designing, implementing, and managing the Project in an efficient, effective and environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>Aurora LNG are committed to meeting health and regulatory requirements as set out by the applicable jurisdictions. Aurora LNG aspires to establish committed and long term relationships with the local community in Prince Rupert, Aboriginal Groups, and other stakeholders. We strive to develop a Project whose presence will have a positive, beneficial and environmentally sustainable role in the local community and within British Columbia.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.</p>
1124 (1 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: Casualisation and downsizing</p> <p>'We believe cuts will have a massive impact on health and safety and that its only a matter of time before someone pays with their life.' John Wall, Amicus Scottish National Secretary. (The report does go on to list several "accidents" that did claim lives.)</p> <p>80% of the North Sea workforce is employed by outsourced contractors rather than directly by the oil companies. 'Flexibility' is desirable to the companies as it allows them to change the number of employees in line with the booms and busts of the oil industry, and to keep costs down by forcing contractors to compete for their business. Outsourcing is also unhelpful in terms of safety, as with a transient workforce it is hard to maintain training, trust and cohesion, and outsourcing blurs the responsibility for accidents between operators and contractors.</p> <p>Mounting accident figures on North Sea platforms have alarmed trade unions and led to questions about Britain's dependency on ageing oil and gas equipment where investment levels have fallen.</p> <p>A confidential report by the Health and Safety Executive seen by the Guardian in December 2004 gave a frightening picture of broken safety equipment, ill-trained workers and badly-maintained systems.</p> <p>'Despite one of the worst disasters in British history and the death of 167 men, the company has not been brought to justice and prosecuted for any offences relating to the death of the workers.'</p> <p>Gavin Cleland, corporate manslaughter campaigner.</p> <p>The major UK oil companies, in the meantime, have continued to erode workers' rights.</p> <p>This was achieved by a series of financial inducements and psychological pressure.</p> <p>The extremely anti-union oil industry and established unions failure to make them a safe place to work.</p> <p>A note on workers</p> <p>Oil workers don't have a great reputation. One source described life on oil rigs as 'builder culture gone mad'. The work is dangerous and requires long hours: 12-14 hours a day, 7 days a week (generally two weeks on and two weeks off). This working pattern is also disruptive to family life.</p> <p>Oil workers may well be ready to speak about how globalisation has affected them through the profit-over-safety attitudes of the oil companies and the increasing casualisation and downsizing of labour.</p> <p>It is probably safe to assume that oil workers will be less willing to speak up on climate change as any serious action on this would spell the end of their jobs.</p> <p>The Grangemouth refinery and the surrounding plants and factories create a fantastical landscape at night, rather like the Blackpool illuminations, and the stories from fence line communities living within the glow of Grangemouth are shocking. There is constant noise and light from gas flaring at night, black smoke and fallout, high levels of asthma and fear of a major explosion. Incredibly, there has been no ongoing independent monitoring of the effects of the refinery on the health of those living nearby.</p> <p>Recently there have been massive job cuts and R&amp;D graduates have been favoured over locals.</p> <p>The conditions also prevent other businesses moving in and have turned the nearby fertile agricultural land into marsh and bog.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with First Nations, Aboriginal, local communities and other stakeholders. We are committed to being a vibrant member of communities through all phases of our activities, including planning, development and operations. We believe that early engagement sets the stage for positive, long-term relationships.</p> <p>Our studies predict a number of beneficial effects on community health and wellness as a result of the project. This includes increased family income, which can lead to improved health status and practices, coping skills and social support networks.</p> <p>Other expected benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$28 billion on construction spending and \$4.5 billion per year on operations;</li> <li>\$11 billion in tax revenues for the government of Canada during construction and operations;</li> <li>average workforce between 2,650 and 3,000 workers with a peak workforce of up to 5,000;</li> <li>\$25 billion in revenue for the BC provincial government during construction and operations; .</li> <li>\$2.6 billion to the BC gross domestic product during construction and \$3.4 billion per year during operations;</li> <li>300 staff during phase 1 operations increasing to approximately 600 staff once the project reaches full build-out;</li> <li>for every 100 direct and indirect jobs created, an estimated 36 induced jobs will be created;</li> </ul> <p>AURORA LNG anticipates that 90% of the operational workforce (approximately 540 workers at full build-out) will be Canadian residents.</p>

1124 (2 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Most locals commute to Falkirk, Glasgow or Edinburgh for work. Many locals are also afraid that the plant is a very serious security risk. There is stronger feeling down the road in Bo'ness, a town that only suffers the pollution and has none of the employment benefits. The 'capture' of Scottish universities represents problems for efforts to reduce climate change by replacing fossil fuels with renewables - public funding for oil and gas research mainly comes out of the same pots as funding for renewables research, so more research in the (big, rich, mature) oil industry means less for the (small, relatively poor, developing) renewables. This hidden subsidy also serves to maintain oil industry competitiveness as compared to renewables and ties the thinking and strategy of universities to the interests of the oil companies."</p> <p>Resources sourced by the G8:</p> <p>1. Rising Tide, Beyond Oil: The oil curse and solutions for an oil-free future, October 2004, <a href="http://www.carbonweb.org/documents/beyond_oil.pdf">www.carbonweb.org/documents/beyond_oil.pdf</a>, last viewed 10.03.05; Platform et al, Some Common Concerns: Imagining BP's Azerbaijan Turkey Georgia pipelines system, October 2002, available to download at <a href="http://www.baku.org.uk/some_common_concerns.htm">www.baku.org.uk/some_common_concerns.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05; Corporate Watch, 'The Oil and Gas industry 蟻 A Guide for UK activists', 1998, <a href="http://www.corporatewatch.org.uk/publications/oil_gas.html">www.corporatewatch.org.uk/publications/oil_gas.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 2. Scottish enterprise website, 'About Scotland', <a href="http://www.scottish-enterprise.com/sedotcom_home/services_to_business_international/lis/aboutscotland/about_scotland-keyfacts.htm">www.scottish-enterprise.com/sedotcom_home/services_to_business_international/lis/aboutscotland/about_scotland-keyfacts.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 3. Platform, Britain: 90 years as a Petro State, (forthcoming publication) 4. Corporate Watch Degrees of Capture: Universities, the Oil Industry and Climate Change, 2003, <a href="http://www.corporatewatch.org.uk/pages/degrees_of_capture.htm">www.corporatewatch.org.uk/pages/degrees_of_capture.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 5. Valerie Darroch, 'African oil hopes for BowLeven on eve of flotation', The Sunday Herald, 05.12.04, <a href="http://www.sundayherald.com/46457">www.sundayherald.com/46457</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 6. Wildcatter who came in from the cold. The Telegraph October 30th 2004 7. Rob Crilly, 'Tigers facing fresh threat at latest frontier in West's search for fuel' The Glasgow Herald 12.04.04, <a href="http://www.5tigers.org/news/2004/April/04_4_12w.htm">www.5tigers.org/news/2004/April/04_4_12w.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 8. KCA Deutag website, 'About KCA Deutag', <a href="http://www.kcadeutag.com/">www.kcadeutag.com/</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 9. AMEC website, 'Rebuilding Iraq', <a href="http://www.amec.com/careers/careers.asp?pageid=699">www.amec.com/careers/careers.asp?pageid=699</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 10. Aberdeen Press and Journal 6/12/04 11. Seth Gitell, 'Cheney's corporate past', The Boston Phoenix, 21.09.00, last viewed 10.03.05 12. Bill Guerin, 'The time bomb that is Papua', Asia Times, 04.12.04, <a href="http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/FL04Ae04.html">www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/FL04Ae04.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 13. Wood News July 2004 14. 'Wealth creation in Scotland' produced by the Royal Bank of Scotland. See note 152. 15. The Scotsman, 09.05.03 16. The Scotsman, 09.05.03 Source: <a href="http://www.ft.com">www.ft.com</a> 17. Brian Wilson, former energy minister and UK special representative on trade opportunities to Iraq, quoted in Brian Brady, 'British firms win 蟻80m in contracts to rebuild Iraq', The Scotsman, 07.09.03, <a href="http://news.scotsman.com/archive.cfm?id=985202003">http://news.scotsman.com/archive.cfm?id=985202003</a>, last viewed 10.03.05. For more info about corporate involvement in Iraq see Corpwatch website, 'War Profiteers', <a href="http://www.warprofiteers.com/article.php?list=type&amp;type=176">www.warprofiteers.com/article.php?list=type&amp;type=176</a>; <a href="http://www.voicesuk.org/">www.voicesuk.org/</a>, last viewed 10.03.05; future of Iraq Protal, <a href="http://www.justinaalexander.net/iraq/">www.justinaalexander.net/iraq/</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 18. Corpwatch website, Calum MacDonald, 'War Profiteers. Scotland: Contract 1030484 Turned Oil into Gold', The Herald, 16.11.04, <a href="http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=11678">www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=11678</a>, last viewed 10.03.05.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1124 (3 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>19. Terry Macalister, 'Iraq cash may be lost, says Weir', The Guardian, 26.08.04, <a href="http://www.occupationwatch.org/article.php?id=6494">www.occupationwatch.org/article.php?id=6494</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 20. 'Iso-Britannia: Etsit 蟻n sopimusvalmistajia ydinvoimalaprojektii', <a href="http://www.finpro.fi/print.asp?Section=143&amp;Item=105109">www.finpro.fi/print.asp?Section=143&amp;Item=105109</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 21. Devonport website, 'About Devonport', <a href="http://www.devonport.co.uk/about-toplevel.htm">www.devonport.co.uk/about-toplevel.htm</a>, last viewed 10.05.03 22. Christian Aid website, 'In Depth, The scorched earth: oil and war in Sudan', March 2001, <a href="http://www.christian-aid.org.uk/indepth/0103suda/sudanoi2.htm">www.christian-aid.org.uk/indepth/0103suda/sudanoi2.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 23. Julie Flint, British Firms Fan Flames of War, The Guardian, 11.03.01, <a href="http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,450030,00.html">http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,450030,00.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 24. Mark Milner, '650 jobs go at BP and Harland', The Guardian, 23.03.02, <a href="http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/story/0,672572,00.html">www.guardian.co.uk/business/story/0,672572,00.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 25. 'Some Common Concerns' see section on 'workers' <a href="http://www.baku.org.uk">www.baku.org.uk</a> 26. BBC News, 'Worker dies on North Sea oil platform', 02.01.05 <a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/4141689.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/4141689.stm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 27. BBC News, 'Shell admits shortcomings', 04.12.03, <a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/3289329.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/3289329.stm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 28. Terry MacAllister, 'Poor safety of North Sea rigs exposed', The Guardian, 09.12.04, <a href="http://www.guardian.co.uk/oil/story/0,11319,1369727,00.html">www.guardian.co.uk/oil/story/0,11319,1369727,00.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 29. Gavin Cleland, Speech, 'Conference on Safety and Corporate Criminal Accountability', October 2003, <a href="http://www.corporateaccountability.org/dl/conf/oct03/cleland.doc">www.corporateaccountability.org/dl/conf/oct03/cleland.doc</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 30. Blowout first edition 6th July 1989. Facsimile in 'Some Common Concerns' 31. 'Some Common Concerns' 32. Just Transition Alliance website, <a href="http://www.jtalliance.org">www.jtalliance.org</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 33. The Refinery Reform Campaign website, (how to set up low tech and low cost community monitoring for your local refinery), <a href="http://www.refineryreform.org/bucket_brigades.htm">www.refineryreform.org/bucket_brigades.htm</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 34. Pers.comm. Anonymous source 35. Scottish Environment Protection Agency, <a href="http://www.sepa.org.uk/index.html">www.sepa.org.uk/index.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 36. Baku-Cayhan Campaign website, 'BP's pipeline record', <a href="http://www.bakuceyhan.org.uk/more_info/bp_pipeline.htm#safe">www.bakuceyhan.org.uk/more_info/bp_pipeline.htm#safe</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 37. Corporate Watch Magazine, Issue 12, 'Fuel Facts...', Autumn 2000, <a href="http://www.corporatewatch.org.uk/magazine/issue12/cw12f4.html">www.corporatewatch.org.uk/magazine/issue12/cw12f4.html</a>, last viewed 10.03.05 38. Living within the Glow - Stories from the fence line. Stories and concerns from Grangemouth and Bo'ness residents' 2004 39. Ibid. <a href="https://corporatewatch.org/content/g8-report-scotland-plc-oil-and-energy-industry-scotland-1">https://corporatewatch.org/content/g8-report-scotland-plc-oil-and-energy-industry-scotland-1</a> "The line between lobbying and capture dissolves with corporations actually integrating themselves into the governmental and super-governmental infrastructure." "This report...aims to raise the important questions that many are asking today about democracy in the face of global rule. Will we be subsumed into a fossil-fuel-addicted economy or will we resist to build vibrant sustainable local economies? Which will win out – ecological sanity or pathological capitalism? Will it be the corporate globalisation of profit and control, or a peoples' globalisation of ideas, creativity and autonomy?" <a href="https://ia800801.us.archive.org/2/items/fp_corpwatchG8report/corpwatchG8report.pdf">https://ia800801.us.archive.org/2/items/fp_corpwatchG8report/corpwatchG8report.pdf</a></p>

1125	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>If projects like this (CNOOC-Nexen's Aurora LNG) are going to go ahead the project should be built in unpopulated areas where the least amount of impact can happen. I do not believe that projects like this should be going forward anyway.</p> <p>The amount of capital invested in these projects is staggering. We should be using this capital to create sustainable sources of energy, it would create way more jobs and be better for the environment and the economy.</p> <p>People say we need to get this stuff out of the ground and sell it now. Why? Is the world over tomorrow? No, we need these resources to make all the technology we rely on, so selling it all now is very near sighted, what about future generations?</p> <p>Destroying my home so China can take our natural resources at a loss to Canadian tax payers is absolutely messed up. My home is being destroyed and we are getting nothing for it, as a country, or a region, or as a community. We are being sold out by our own government so that some foreign company can take our Canadian resources.</p> <p>Anybody who thinks this will be a financial windfall for Canadians should actually research the numbers on this, financially and environmentally, and they will be shocked to see just how many lies they have been fed.</p> <p>Our government shouldn't be allowed to enslave our country into deals beyond their own governing term. It's enslaving not just this generation but the next generation as well. Why should my child have to abide by these long-term deals that are made by a governing body that will be dead?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns raised in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the Project, including on residents of Prince Rupert and Dodge Cove, and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1126 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>An very relevant article that should be read.</p> <p>Four More Whoppers about LNG in British Columbia The real facts behind Christy Clark's rosy claims.</p> <p>By Andrew Nikiforuk 16 Mar 2016   TheTyee.ca Andrew Nikiforuk is an award-winning journalist who has been writing about the energy industry for two decades and is a contributing editor to The Tyee. Nikiforuk's book on hydraulic fracturing, Slick Water, was published this fall by Greystone Books.</p> <p>BC Premier Christy Clark: a million-dollar website to drum up LNG jobs, but not a single job yet.</p> <p>The B.C. budget claims the province is making money from shale gas. But last month The Tyee showed the province is pouring more cash into the industry than it is getting back.</p> <p>Three Wacky Accounting Numbers for LNG and Shale Gas In fact the only time the B.C. government made any money from shale gas was during a land lease boom nearly a dozen years ago. Ever since then, revenues have dwindled to next to nothing due to low royalties and taxpayer-funded subsidies to the ailing shale gas industry. Dig deeper, and four more claims made by the B.C. government turn out to be liquefied natural gas whoppers as well.</p> <p>New information on employment numbers, shale gas reserves, transmission lines and the LNG promise of economic prosperity show that stretching the truth remains a persistent trend in the Christy Clark administration.</p> <p>Whopper #1: Vastly less gas to sell than claimed Let's begin with the government claim that British Columbia "has more than an estimated 2,900 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of marketable shale gas reserves," or more methane in the ground than the entire United States.</p> <p>Last year David Hughes, a former analyst with Natural Resources Canada who mapped much of the nation's coal and gas supplies, took a hard look at real reserves and found that the government claim had no basis in reality.</p> <p>Hughes pointed out in a report for the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives that the BC Oil and Gas Commission estimated that B.C. only had 376 tcf of marketable shale resources. (Hughes added 40 tcf to this number for good measure, for a total of 416 tcf, to account for possible resources in developing plays.) But proven reserves, or what industry can extract with existing technology, were only 44.4 tcf. That's one sixty-fifth of the government's inflated figure of 2,900 tcf. When Hughes noted that the emperor was wearing no clothes, the emperor (Minister of Natural Gas Development Rich Coleman) accused Hughes of misrepresenting the facts. Coleman wrote an op-ed that said "B.C.'s natural gas supports long-term prosperity." The op-ed did not correct the government's accounting errors.</p> <p>But according to a series of freedom of information requests just received by Marc Lee at the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, that's not what civil servants were telling politicians.</p> <p>In several email exchanges, they admitted that the government had used the wrong terminology and "misused terms or values such as 'reserves,' 'resources,' or 'marketable' in describing B.C.'s oil and gas endowment."</p> <p>Hughes notes that the BC Oil and Gas Commission now estimates raw methane reserves in the province to be 51 tcf. Once processed, that gas might amount to 44.4 tcf.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges receipt of the referenced article.</p>

1126 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Yet National Energy Board regulators had already approved 12 export permits totalling 205 tcf at the time Hughes's report was published, and were reviewing seven more with a combined total of 435 tcf (the NEB has since approved another six permits). If the Clark government's aspirations of five LNG terminals come to fruition, this would require exports of 150 tcf of gas by 2040, or more than three times current proven marketable reserves. Given the uncertainties in resource estimates compared to proven reserves, coupled with Canada's own needs, Hughes, a conservative energy analyst, questions the wisdom of a strategy hell-bent on liquidating these finite resources as fast as possible, particularly if B.C. and Canada care about meeting the greenhouse gas emission reductions committed to in the Paris climate talks. Yet the dubious figure of 2,900 tcf remains on the government website. Whopper #2: Vastly fewer LNG jobs than claimed The next wacky accounting LNG figure concerns the government claim that its non-existent industry will gainfully employ 100,000 British Columbians some great day in some near future, or more specifically 2018. Last year, Lee at the CCPA also dug into that fiction. He discovered that the impressive and magical number came from a report written by the accounting firm Grant Thornton. The firm only used government-provided data and economic models. Not surprisingly the government published the report just prior to the 2013 election. In his study Lee found the numbers were highly inflated and bore no resemblance to the real economic world of LNG. Lee concluded that B.C.'s LNG sector could be expected to support "only 2,000 to 3,000 construction jobs per LNG terminal over three years and 200 to 300 permanent workers once operational." As a consequence, five LNG terminals might create between 15,000 short-time jobs, but not 100,000. When Lee released his findings last year the government immediately attacked the CCPA report as "misguided and poorly researched." A freedom of information request, however, has revealed, once again, that email exchanges between civil servants largely supported Lee's version: real job creation numbers might be a few thousand but not 100,000. One email thread confirms that the Petronas Pacific NorthWest LNG project will launch only "330 long-term operation careers." Clear-headed analyses by the industry around the world also confirm Lee's realistic job assessment and question the government's credibility. The International Monetary Fund, for example, recognizes LNG as a capital-intensive industry with a poor record of job creation. A typical LNG plant will only create a few hundred jobs during the planning phase, a few thousand during the construction phase, and only a few hundred when operating. That's it. Consider the example of Mozambique, which wants to exploit its rich offshore natural gas reserves. A 2014 report on its prospects emphasized the well-known fact that LNG is not a job-creating industry. "In terms of employment, the capital intensive nature of the industry means that its direct contribution to job creation is extremely limited, at less than 0.5 per cent of formal sector jobs," explained the Oxford Institute for Energy Studies report. "Of key importance will be the ability to link the extractive sector -- which is capital intensive and responsible for few direct jobs -- to the wider economy," added the report.</p>	
1127 (1 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Part 2: And then the report makes this notable revelation: "Unlike the situation in Tanzania, where politicians frequently promise citizens tens of thousands of jobs in the gas industry, the Mozambique government's expectations of massive job creation have already been moderated. Most estimates put job creation linked to the LNG ventures at around 7,000-7,500." To date, a million-dollar government website designed to connect citizens looking for work in the LNG industry has not connected anybody to anything. But it has employed one previous politician, Gordon Wilson, a former leader of the BC Liberal party. Wilson now earns \$150,000 a year to advocate for a capital-intensive industry that hasn't created any jobs -- except for Clark supporters. In Australia, LNG has left another poor employment horror show that the government in B.C. has failed to study or acknowledge. Unfettered LNG exports in Australia not only increased both natural gas and electricity costs for consumers, but also reduced the manufacturing sector's ability to compete and create jobs. "U.S. policymakers should look to the Australian LNG export example as a warning for what can occur due to escalating LNG exports," recently warned one industrial energy consumers' group. In other words, a successful LNG business could kill the province's manufacturing base by inflating natural gas prices. Whopper #3: No, LNG prosperity is not close at hand Along with the jobs fiction, the government has also manufactured a prosperity fiction. In February the Conference Board of Canada published a glowing report on the province's proposed 21 LNG projects called "A Changing Tide: British Columbia's Emerging Liquefied Natural Gas Industry." Even though not one project has proceeded to the construction phase, the optimistic report concluded that just three large LNG terminals could export 30 million tons per annum (MTPA). Such activity would generate 33,000 permanent jobs and \$7 billion in investment and raise GDP. It would also double the amount of shale gas production by an additional five billion cubic feet, and carpet-bomb much of northeastern B.C. with gas wells. But these figures are all pie in the sky and again bear no resemblance to reality. Here's one bitter taste of reality. Most readers will recall that Apache Corp., a Houston-based energy firm, conducted some of the largest frack jobs in northern B.C. and was one of the first companies to champion an LNG terminal. But in 2014 it sold its interests in its Kitimat proposal along with an Australian project. Here's why: last year the shale fracking company posted a loss of nearly \$25 billion. That's right: \$25 billion. Fracking shale gas, an exercise in declining returns, rarely pays the bills. More reality can be found in a 2015 report by Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, a rigorous non-profit educational group based in London that analyzed the prospects for North America's LNG industry. It was blunt: "Despite Canada's abundance of gas resources and the plethora of proposed LNG export schemes, the current business environment, characterized by low oil prices and industry consolidation, does not indicate that any Canadian LNG scheme will be commissioned before the middle of the next decade."  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	Aurora LNG acknowledges receipt of the referenced article.

1127 (2 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Moreover, "the window of opportunity to capture premium Asian markets has eluded the Canadian projects" because of deep uncertainty and falling demand in those markets. U.S. LNG projects are also cheaper.</p> <p>The report concluded that the fate of Canadian projects is tied to the price of oil, and they would only succeed if oil were selling for somewhere between \$76 to \$90 a barrel, "which does not seem competitive with the first generation" of U.S. LNG projects.</p> <p>In other words there is no emerging LNG industry in Canada, and if one does appear it won't arrive until 2025, or nearly a decade from now. And even that is uncertain.</p> <p>The Conference Board (which makes no mention of the Oxford Institute report) was funded by Progress Energy, which is owned by Petronas, the Malaysian state-owned oil giant backing the Pacific NorthWest LNG project.</p> <p>Most media stories on the report failed to mention this apparent conflict of interest. But the government of B.C. is only too happy to cite this as gospel while cheerleading a fantasy industry.</p> <p>Whopper #4: Yes, Site C dam is for powering frackers Last but not least come some wacky accounting numbers on the Site C dam, a \$9-billion public works project that analysts generally agree will increase everyone's electricity bills. Although provincial authorities swear the project has nothing to do with LNG, Ben Parfitt, an investigative journalist, has revealed otherwise in a DeSmog Canada article.</p> <p>Last January, the province announced a new \$300-million transmission line to power shale gas development in the south Peace Region. Two other transmission lines are also being proposed. The lines will allow shale gas drillers to use electricity to power their operations instead of methane.</p> <p>As a consequence they'll have more gas to export and access to cheap energy subsidized by taxpayers.</p> <p>What the press release did not explain, notes Parfitt, is that "virtually all of this new transmission infrastructure is being built at public expense to provide power to one entity and one entity alone -- the natural gas industry."</p> <p>Two other proposed lines reinforce the story. One 140 kilometre-long project will fragment the forest to bring power to the Pink Mountain Region in the north Montney basin. It will benefit one shale gas extractor in particular: Progress Energy.</p> <p>That shale gas drilling company is owned by Petronas, which successfully lobbied the government to lower its LNG tax rates. Meanwhile, Progress Energy paid for the boosterish Conference Board report.</p> <p>Petronas is also one of the backers of the controversial Pacific NorthWest LNG project off Lelu Island at the mouth of the Skeena River.</p> <p>ATCO, the anointed builder of the Petronas transmission line, recently argued that no public review of the project was necessary and asked for an exemption under Section 22 of the Utilities Commission Act.</p> <p>"The project is being developed on an aggressive schedule to meet with Progress [Energy] timelines. Failure to meet these timelines reduces the feasibility of electrification and poses a substantial threat to the project proceeding."</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
1127 (3 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Energy Minister Bill Bennett supported the corporate request in a Business in Vancouver story: "My understanding right now is that if I do not direct the BCUC [British Columbia Utilities Commission] to allow these projects to go ahead, that we may lose some interest on the part of the gas companies.... They just don't feel that they can wait for a long BCUC process."</p> <p>When politicians elect to bypass mandated legislated safeguards to protect the public purse by evaluating the need for projects (and that's what the BCUC does), then they are no longer working for taxpayers.</p> <p>But the logic is clear, says Parfitt. "The more transmission lines erected to allegedly 'green up' the field operations of fossil fuel companies, the more fossil fuel industry activity. The more such activity, the more the government and BC Hydro can justify Site C."</p> <p>It's all a self-serving story. The government produces wacky numbers and accounting figures to justify corporate LNG scheming that no longer make any economic sense.</p> <p>Years ago Jacque Ellul, the French philosopher, noted that "propaganda is called upon to solve the problems created by technology, to play on maladjustments, and to integrate the individual into a technological world." It's how government and industry now work.</p> <p>In B.C. the government uses propaganda not only to integrate its citizens into its wacky LNG fantasy, but to subsidize foreign companies and pay for unneeded dams and transmission lines at the same time.</p> <p>It is designed to make taxpayers smile while they are being robbed.</p> <p><a href="https://theyee.ca/Opinion/2016/03/16/Whoopers-BC-LNG/">https://theyee.ca/Opinion/2016/03/16/Whoopers-BC-LNG/</a></p>	
1128	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Hammerfest again: These concerns highlighted by the town of Hammerfest are all very valid and definitely are ones that have already been an issue with the communities of Dodge Cove, and the town of Prince Rupert, or issues that will be felt in the future especially if the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project gets approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contact with stakeholders faded away once the social license to operate was achieved.</li> <li>- residents had to sacrifice time (eg. Fishermen sacrificed time at sea) to engage in talks with Statoil to save their livelihood</li> <li>- during construction, Hammerfest became invaded by a huge mobile work force, which occupied all the tourist accommodations which then directly harmed the tourism industry.</li> <li>- local residents were overwhelmed and stopped visiting bars and restaurants</li> <li>- the local community is now dependent on Statoil's financial contributions and property taxes, but merely transferring money to the community does not create community development.</li> <li>- the town was a local small-scale community, with the municipality forming policies, changed drastically to Statoil becoming the dominant power</li> <li>- local concerns for community development were overshadowed</li> <li>- community development is mainly addressed by the "local user" community and lacks support from the "national policy" community</li> <li>- the oil and gas industry just "ticked the boxes" that they had to re: environmental soundness and community development, rather than a real long-term investment in those areas - contacts with fishermen, local inhabitants and NGO's faded away once the company got what it wanted.</li> <li>- "Performance- based supervision allows Statoil to consult national research institutes of their own choice to monitor different parts of the environment, which are not allowed to advise Statoil in policy making. Monitoring results are submitted by Statoil and discussed one-one one with the state agency at stake.</li> <li>-research is broken up across different research institutes and state agencies with different scopes and little communication between them. - In the end, knowledge in this marine community is concentrated in the national policy community which compromised access to this knowledge for all stakeholders. Statoil becomes rather powerful due to this monitoring system because it is the only one who has a proper overview of all available knowledge.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300080159_Liquefied_natural_gas_production_at_Hammerfest_A_transforming_marine_community">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300080159_Liquefied_natural_gas_production_at_Hammerfest_A_transforming_marine_community</a></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concern raised by this comment. While the quoted publication was not referenced in the Aurora LNG Application to the BC EAO, the case study of Hammerfest was included in Section 13.5 of the Application. In addition to the case study of Hammerfest, numerous other case studies were also cited in the Application (particularly Sections 5.2 and 13.5). Case studies include; Kitimat, BC; Terrace BC; Williston, North Dakota; North Berwick, Main; and Gladstone, Australia.</p>



1129	2017-03-09	Lana Lowe - Fort Nelson First Nation	<p>Fort Nelson First Nation is pleased to provide initial comments on the Application by Nexen Energy ULC for its proposed Aurora LNG Digby Island liquefied natural gas ("LNG") facility near Prince Rupert, BC, and on the associated environmental assessment of the proposed Project.</p> <p>This submission provides the BC EAO and CEAA with information on how the proposed Project will impact upon FNFN rights and interests as currently proposed, and what needs to be done to better assess these impacts and infringements. Despite not being afforded any form of status in this environmental assessment by the federal or provincial government to date, FNFN will show evidence herein that we are likely to be one of the most adversely affected parties, due to the inducement of upstream gas development activities in our territory by the proposed Project.</p> <p>See attached document</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. The discussion of potential effects on Fort Nelson First Nation rights and interests is beyond the scope of the environmental assessment for the Aurora LNG project as set out by the BC EAO in its Section 11 Order (as amended) and the Application Information Requirements.</p>
1130 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Non-aboriginal Pacific Northwest Coast maritime culture has not been discussed on any level. When looking for maritime culture in Canada, one invariably is directed to the East Coast Maritime provinces. When looking for Pacific Northwest Coast culture, one is pointed to the rich native culture historically and present.</p> <p>There is much written about the HISTORY of non-aboriginal communities here on the Pacific coast, but there doesn't seem to be any direct studies or assessment of the present culture, and how quickly it is being impacted and changed by outside forces. This is somewhat of a modest approach of the residents of these communities, to not see our daily lives as important or as having any special meaning, and also since most of us live the way we do since we want to be left alone. Yet if the capability of being able to practice this culture is removed, then how will this culture survive?</p> <p>With these major industrial projects such as Aurora LNG that is threatening to engulf the community of Dodge Cove, this will have a drastic impact on the culture of which we are part of. I don't see much acknowledgment of this, or awareness on behalf of the government. The loss of this unique way of living will be a loss for this region, this province, and this country. It used to amuse me to tell people the story about my uncle, who has travelled the world all over, and lives predominantly in southern BC. He had just returned from a trip to Portugal, and then flew north to visit us and so of course we brought him by skiff to our property on Digby Island, and I just remember his comment that is was a bigger culture shock for him to come visit me on Digby than it was when he went to Portugal. It really emphasized for me that we are living in a unique way, and what is second nature to us is surprising to other people.</p> <p>"Culture is essential for human beings since it is the key for people to identify themselves and fit in the groups. The culture can be the sum total of people's behaviors, along with the things such as language, traditions including burial rituals, weddings, and so on. People will build their networks and relationships according to those cultural ideas, and form different types of groups of people. The similarities between the lifestyles of a people and their descendants pass on, gradually developing a cultural heritage.</p> <p>Modernization<sup>2</sup> and economic development is another cause of cultural extinction. In addition, cultural imperialism<sup>3</sup> can also force some minority cultures die. The phenomena of cultural extinction are increasing all over the world. Cultural extinction includes the loss of language, traditions, habits, and customs. Like the various species of animals and plants, cultures can become extinct as well</p> <p>Many traditional ways of life are also being lost because of industrialization and modernization.</p> <p>What we can do to help preserve endangered cultures? Firstly, we need to raise people's awareness how important different cultures are and what the negative consequence would be if more and more cultures become extinct. In addition, people who are not members of a particular culture in their country should learn about the endangered cultures and the value that culture adds to the entire country. Countries need to identify innovative technologies and solutions to help preserve different cultures and cooperate with each other. Governments must work to stop cultural extinction.</p> <p><a href="https://msmunatunagb.wikispaces.com/file/view/Cultural+Extinction.pdf">https://msmunatunagb.wikispaces.com/file/view/Cultural+Extinction.pdf</a></p> <p>Intangible heritage focuses on the customs, celebrations and human geography that is found in such places.</p> <p>Songs feature heavily, as do oral stories, festivals, traditional craft items and the knowledge required to produce them. Sometimes, even rituals, as practised by a shaman, or what Unesco describes as "practices concerning the universe", find their place. Underpinning the concept of intangible heritage is the belief that these things that make a people – a nation, a place – tick are handed down from one generation to another. That is something to be celebrated in an increasingly globalised world becoming more homogenous by the day.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the comment.</p>
1130 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>(It should be noted that of all the different cultures that are considered as being impacted and should be acknowledged as need help, from many different countries, that Canada has absolutely nothing on this list) <a href="http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/topics-domaines/ip-pi/canculture.aspx?lang=en">http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/topics-domaines/ip-pi/canculture.aspx?lang=en</a></p> <p>The drafters of the 1948 Genocide Convention considered the use of the term (cultural genocide) but dropped it from their consideration. The legal definition of genocide is left unspecified about the exact nature in which genocide is done only that it is destruction with intent to destroy a racial, religious, ethnic or national group as such.</p> <p>Article 7 of a 1994 draft of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples uses the phrase "cultural genocide" but does not define what it means. The complete article reads as follows:</p> <p>Indigenous peoples have the collective and individual right not to be subjected to ethnocide and cultural genocide, including prevention of and redress for:</p> <p>(a) Any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities;</p> <p>(b) Any action which has the aim or effect of dispossessing them of their lands, territories or resources;</p> <p>(c) Any form of population transfer which has the aim or effect of violating or undermining any of their rights;</p> <p>(d) Any form of assimilation or integration by other cultures or ways of life imposed on them by legislative, administrative or other measures;</p> <p>(e) Any form of propaganda directed against them.</p> <p>This declaration only appeared in a draft. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly during its 62nd session at UN Headquarters in New York City on 13 September 2007, but only mentions "genocide", not "cultural genocide", although the article is otherwise unchanged.</p> <p>Indigenous:</p> <p>1. originating in and characteristic of a particular region or country; native (often followed by to): the plants indigenous to Canada; the indigenous peoples of southern Africa.</p> <p>There are people that presently live in Dodge Cove that are indigenous to Dodge Cove.</p> <p>There are people living on Digby Island that are indigenous to this region and others that are indigenous to coastal BC.</p> <p>There is nowhere else that is home. This is OUR culture, this is OUR home.</p>	

1131 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I wish to voice my concerns regarding the new proposed Liquefied Natural Gas project on Digby Island, British Columbia. Please see the attached PDF outlining these concerns. Thank you for your time and sincere consideration.</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing today to voice my concerns regarding the Aurora LNG Digby Island Project.</p> <p>As an ex-resident with close ties to the community of Dodge Cove and a Masters Student studying Environmental Sciences, I am attempting to see rationally how this project could be allowed to proceed. The present costs associated with the risk to people and ecosystems appear to outweigh any economic benefits from this project. Some areas of concern that I feel should be addressed properly are: Consultation and consideration for the people living in the area; wildlife and ecosystem impacts of marine, wetland and terrestrial habitats; mitigation of marine transport risk; mitigation of short and long-term impacts to air and fresh-water; and mitigation of noise pollution impacts on both people and wildlife.</p> <p>Present evidence points to a lack of proper consideration of all the above concerns in the planning of this project. I hope this is seriously considered in the coming phases of impact assessment.</p> <p>Some serious concerns have been voiced by the community less than 1 km away from the proposed project. These are impacting the residents negatively and affecting their physical and mental well-being.</p> <p>These serious concerns include: Significant impacts from noise (including intense helicopter traffic within 500 m of homes), light, air and water pollution during construction and operation of the facility; proposed construction of a 3 lane highway through pristine wetlands and less than 500m from homes; loss of heritage, history, and quality of life; proposed construction of an off-loading facility requiring dredging and removal of eel grass habitat; a proposed tanker terminal which does not comply with the standards as set out by The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO); the potential for collision, severe winter storms, grounding of vessels, and oil spills or LNG tank ruptures; health risk associated with airshed, drinking water and soil pollution from NO2, SO2, CO, H2S, Particulate Matter and Volatile Organic compounds as well as CO2 and methane (the Prince Rupert Airshed study conducted by the BC Ministry of the Environment indicates the highest concentrations of pollutants will be directly above the community of Dodge Cove); degraded air and water quality causing acidification could have severe and long lasting negative effects on wetland species; disturbance to the riparian zone of Delusion Bay could negatively affect nesting waterfowl; road construction proposed through pristine undisturbed wetlands which would be severely degraded and pose a risk to migrating species as they cross; tall flare stacks emitting burning gasses in line with migration routes of geese, ducks, swans, sandhill cranes, numerous shore birds and song birds</p> <p>These concerns should included in any cost benefit analysis of the proposed project. Detailed mitigation measures should also be outlined and communicated to the residents of the area.</p> <p>Please consider these concerns, my opposition and the opposition of the residents of the area in the coming phases of this project. Above all else, please consider the people who will have to live in close proximity, downwind and downstream of this project, and their physical and mental well-being.</p>	<p>While Aurora LNG recognizes that effects on all quality of life attributes are difficult to accurately measure and evaluate, or effectively mitigate to the satisfaction of Dodge Cove residents, Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce potential Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. In response to your concerns related to human health with respect to air quality, noise and drinking water, the Human Health assessment in Section 8.2 of the Application (Human Health) and noted in the Human Health Technical Data Report (Appendix R of the Application), assessed the potential health risk to residents of Dodge Cove and more distant communities is not significant. Specifically;</p> <p>1) Air Quality - The predicted concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter at Dodge Cove and other populated areas in the study area do not exceed any of the short-term (1-hour) or long-term (annual) BC ambient air quality objectives. This comparison is highly conservative, applying the "worst case" air modelling conditions with regulatory objectives that are conservatively derived (i.e., protective of health-sensitive people).</p> <p>2) Noise - The levels of noise were below the threshold for "percent highly annoyed" based on Health Canada/Oil and Gas Commission's guidelines for assessing noise-related annoyance levels.</p> <p>3) Drinking Water - potential Project effects to the Dodge Cove drinking water reservoir (Lake 11 in Section 4.5 of the Application) are not expected to change the water quality in a manner that would influence human health or that would require a water filtration system.</p> <p>To help companies choose potential locations for a LNG port facility and manage potential risks, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), of which the project partners are members, published a list of "general considerations" in 1997. According to SIGTTO, these considerations were meant as "basic guides to prompt special inquiry into particular aspects" (SIGTTO Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, 1997). Aurora LNG used the SIGTTO recommendations when choosing Digby Island as the site of our proposed facility. Aurora LNG also followed separate guidelines established by the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC). In choosing Digby Island as the proposed Aurora LNG site, location-specific risks were identified, these risks will undergo further assessment to determine appropriate mitigation measures as part of the engineering design phase.</p> <p>With respect to the SIGTTO, Aurora LNG is of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location, is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance. The document titled Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In terms of wildlife concerns; Aurora LNG assessed effects of direct and indirect disturbance to terrestrial wildlife and marine birds in Section 4.7 and 4.11 of the Application, respectively. Aurora LNG has proposed several mitigation measures to reduce potential disturbance effects to bird species, including nesting birds.</p>
1131 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>A complete list of proposed mitigation measures is provided in Sections 4.7.5 and 4.11.5, but include: Adhering to recommended disturbance setbacks for high-disturbance activities and helicopter flights around active bald eagle and heron nesting locations. Clearing vegetation within the PDA outside of restricted activity periods for migratory birds, raptors, and herons. Maintaining no-disturbance setbacks around active nest locations. These mitigation measures are expected to reduce potential disturbance to waterfowl and other breeding birds potentially breeding in shoreline, riparian, or other forested and wetland habitats within the LAA. The marine riparian disturbance buffer of 30 m will be applied during all phases of the Project and is expected to buffer retained habitats on Digby Island from potential noise disturbance throughout Project operation.</p> <p>Section 1.2.5.1 of the Application describes the proposed flare system design. Aurora LNG considered placement options of the flare system within the PDA to reduce potential interaction with environmental valued components and to limit the amount of light dispersal (Table 1-26). Changes in mortality risk from injury or collision with the flare system are discussed in Sections 4.7.5.3 and 4.11.5.3. As per mitigation measure 4.7.20, maintenance flaring events will be scheduled during daylight hours to the extent practicable to further reduce attraction by birds to flare system infrastructure during nocturnal migration or foraging. Consistent with mitigation 4.7.13, Aurora LNG will provide employees and contractors with educational materials to increase awareness of lighting effects on migratory birds and lighting mitigation that will reduce light use and dispersal during sensitive timing windows. Collectively, these actions are expected to reduce potential effects of injury or mortality to birds. However, Aurora LNG is committed to monitoring the effectiveness of this mitigation measure through the reporting of injuries and mortalities (mitigation measures 4.7.14 and 4.7.16).</p> <p>In terms of Vegetation and Wetland Resources concerns, Aurora LNG assessed the potential effects on vegetation and wetland resources within section 4.06 of the Application. Aurora LNG has proposed habitat compensation measures to offset the loss of important wetlands (including eelgrass beds) and their attendant habitat functions in accordance with regional guidance on the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation issued by Environment Canada. See Appendix U Wetland Compensation Plan and Appendix V Conceptual Fish Habitat Offsetting Plan, for more information. Mitigation measures pertaining to vegetation and wetlands are provided in Tables 4.6-10, 4.6-11, and 4.6-13 within section 4.06 of the Application. For the Application Case, 8 ha of vegetated ecological communities deemed sensitive to soil acidification occur within the soil acidification exceedance (see Figure 4.6 4 and see Section 3.6 and Table 3-8 of Appendix I, Vegetation and Wetland Resources TDR), which account for less than 1% of the vegetated area of the RAA. These 8 ha, all on Digby Island, are composed of upland forest (3.8 ha) and wetlands (3.9 ha). The predicted change in the condition of ecological communities sensitive to soil acidification is low in magnitude, because the predicted effects will be within the Vegetation Acidification Local Assessment Area and will not require active management to sustain these communities within the Regional Assessment Area (RAA). The predicted change in abundance or condition of ecological communities of interest will not interfere with the sustainable persistence of these communities in the RAA. Potential Project residual effects to vegetation and wetland resources are predicted to be not significant, given the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and that significance criteria listed in Table 4.6 6 (section 4.06) are not exceeded.</p>
1132	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>If it has not already been looked at by the BCEAO regarding the Aurora LNG proposed project, there is a report that was done by Compass. It is called "Impact Assessment of LNG and Other Development on the Metlakatla First Nation" prepared in 2014.</p> <p>This report highlights many issues in this area, many concerns that would not just be for Metlakatla but also for other residents in the area.</p> <p>At the time it assessed the potential impacts of 4 proposed LNG project: BG group Prince Rupert LNG, Spectra's Westcoast Connector LNG pipeline (to supply BG Group), Petronas' PNW, and TransCanada's proposed Prince Rupert Gas Transmission pipeline (to supply PNW).</p> <p>Aurora LNG at the time of the release of this study was still months away from switching their proposed LNG terminal site from Grassy Point to Digby Island, otherwise I am sure that they also would have been named in this study. Even so, the study highlights several areas of impact and does a good job of reflecting many concerns, and includes statistics and data that may not be shown in the Aurora LNG final application.</p>	<p>Relevant information from the Compass Resource Management Ltd.'s "Impact Assessment of LNG and Other Development on the Metlakatla First Nation" document was integrated into Section 12 (Aboriginal Consultation) of the Application.</p>

1133 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition - Hazelton, British Columbia	<p>Public Comment re: Environmental Assessment Certificate for Aurora LNG Digby Island Project</p> <p>Introduction Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition (SWCC) is a diverse group of people living and working in the Skeena River watershed. Our board of directors and membership reflect the broad interests of the people in this region. We are united in understanding that short term industrial development plans, even 50 year plans, will not benefit our region in the long run if they undermine the social and environmental fabric that holds the watershed and its communities together. SWCC's mission is to cultivate a sustainable future from a sustainable environment rooted in culture and a wild salmon ecosystem. Objectives and strategies arising from this mission include educating the public and decision-makers in order to increase awareness and understanding of the natural ecological and human assets that currently exist, as well as helping to create a vibrant and resilient future for the Skeena watershed.</p> <p>SWCC has formally participated in EA processes and reviewed submissions for both BC and Canada dating back to 2004. Most recently, SWCC participated on multiple levels in the CEAA draft Environmental Assessment Report for PNW LNG in 2016.</p> <p>The following written comments are in regard to the application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate for Aurora LNG Digby Island project.</p> <p>Comments SWCC's assessment of the Aurora LNG Digby Island project application found an inadequacy and insufficiency of baseline data. Adequate and sufficient baseline data are critical to the environmental assessment process due to the required subsequent effects assessment and cumulative effects — both of which revolve around and depend on complete and sufficient baseline data.</p> <p>The lack of adequate baseline data has led to faulty conclusions regarding the effects assessment, the cumulative effects assessment, predicted residual effects, and the conclusions in regard to the Valued Components.</p> <p>Due to the proposed projects location at the mouth of the Skeena River, which is an internationally significant salmon producing river, potential adverse effects are inadequately addressed at a basic level. The marine environment adjacent to the proposed project is considered a biological hotspot in relation to the overall Skeena estuary and the BC Northcoast.</p> <p>Over the last forty years, numerous studies led by the federal government and development proponents have concluded that the Skeena River estuary is one of the most biologically productive areas on the BC Pacific coast. These past studies have noted the many potential adverse impacts to marine resources if development were to be located in the vicinity of the Skeena Estuary. It is considered pointless to attempt to interpret why this current application is in strong conflict with past effects conclusions at the species, habitat, and ecosystem levels.</p> <p>SWCC considers the Application inadequate; the baseline data needs to be developed and then thoroughly evaluated as to potential impacts and effects. The rush to develop LNG facilities on the north coast has resulted in compromised data collection, and hurried analysis and interpretation. SWCC's concern with sound and quality decision-making in the Skeena estuary converges with Fisheries Act and Canadian Environmental Protection Act legislation and with the long-term sustainability of the Skeena watershed, Skeena estuary, and the BC north coast.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project. Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition's (SWCC's) over-riding comment is that insufficient marine baseline information was collected to inform the Environmental Assessment. Particular reference is made to the importance of the Skeena River and associated estuary to Pacific salmon.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a complementary suite of approaches to develop a comprehensive marine baseline study, which included beach seines, tangle nets, bottom trawls, mid-water trawls, ROV observations, intertidal observations, eelgrass surveys, traditional ecological knowledge, and literature review (see the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat TDR, Appendix L). This study included repeated fish sampling of all sites within the PDA; sites were sampled using beach seines 4 to 6 times and using tangle nets 3 to 6 times between April 2014 and May 2016. These field data were used to provide site-specific information and are interpreted within the context of existing information on the Skeena estuary, including use by Pacific salmon. Specifically, SWCC are referred to Section 4.2.3.1 in the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat TDR (Appendix L). In particular, Table 7 lists studies of juvenile Pacific salmon use of the Skeena River estuary, which are reviewed within the text, paying particular attention to species-specific residency time and peak residency. Information obtained via literature review in combination with the field studies (and not the field studies alone) is used to develop a characterization of the Project area and the region surrounding it.</p> <p>The ecological value of the Project Development Area is recognized by Aurora LNG, and this importance has been explicitly considered in the Environmental Assessment. The Marine Fish and Fish Habitat TDR (Appendix L) explicitly discusses the presence and value of, among other habitats, marine intertidal and subtidal habitat, estuarine marsh and meadow, eelgrass and kelp. As further examples, the report also discusses the following (not an exhaustive list): Chatham Sound's status as an Ecologically and Biologically Significant Area.</p> <p>The presence of DFO designated Important Areas near the Project, including Pacific herring, Pollock and eulachon.</p> <p>The proximity of the Project to nearby rockfish conservation areas.</p> <p>The importance of the Skeena River estuary for juvenile Pacific salmon (explicitly discussed in Section 4.2.3.1).</p> <p>The rich biodiversity associated with highly productive kelp beds and rocky habitat around South Digby Island; from the Executive Summary of Appendix L (page iii): "Numerous species of marine vegetation and algae were observed in the intertidal and subtidal zones of South Digby Island, including native eelgrass, surfgrass (Phyllospadix spp.) and understory and canopy-forming kelps." It goes on to further describe the eelgrass areas and the many species that associate with these areas.</p> <p>The eelgrass areas and estuarine meadows within Delusion Bay are detailed and fully recognized along with the range of fish species that use these areas.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1133 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition - Hazelton, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>SWCC argues that the proposed LNG plant should not be situated in the vicinity of the Skeena estuary.</p> <p>Conclusion After reviewing the application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate, SWCC findings do not support the application, and further, the Aurora LNG facility as currently proposed. The main reasons are the location of the proposed facility and the high quality habitats, which are proposed to be altered, proximity to existing communities, lack of LNG pipeline certainty and lack of LNG resources, inadequate consultation with impacted upstream rights &amp; title holders and broader climate change implications of the LNG industry at the proposed scale that Aurora LNG would enable. The proposed LNG facility needs to find a new location that is more appropriate.</p> <p>SWCC considers the application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate inadequate. In particular, baseline data needs to be substantially strengthened in order to enable determination of potential impacts and effects. This is not currently possible given the hasty nature of baseline collection. SWCC submits that the potential environmental, social, cultural, economic, and health-related effects from the project pose unacceptable risks.</p> <p>Closure If the BC EA has any questions, please do not hesitate to contact SWCC at the above contact information. Best regards, Shannon McPhail Executive Director</p>	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>These rich, ecologically important habitats are considered not only in the Environmental Assessment proper (Section 4.9.5.2, specifically), but also in the associated Conceptual Fish Habitat Offsetting Plan (Appendix V). Consequently, Aurora LNG believes that the ecological value of the Project area, the Skeena River estuary and Chatham Sound are adequately characterized, fully acknowledged and appropriately incorporated into the Environmental Assessment.</p>
1134	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>I'm local and I support this project.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates the comment in support of the proposed Project.</p>

1135 (1 of 4)	2017-03-09	Council of the Haida Nation - Haida Gwaii, British Columbia	<p>COUNCIL OF THE HAIDA NATION  Re: Aurora LNG Digby Island Project</p> <p>We write in response to the email from Vivian Au of CEAA on February 13, 2017 informing us that the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) is soliciting public comments on the proponent's Application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate for the Project until March 9, 2017. Below are our concerns regarding the Project based on the Project Description and Executive Summary dated in 2014. According to these documents, the Project involves the phased construction and operation of an LNG export facility near Prince Rupert, either at Digby Island or Grassy Point (near Lax Kw'alaams) (the "Project"). The CEAA website and the December 2016 Public Notice identify that the Project will be situated at Digby Island and operate for a minimum of 25 years. We understand the federal assessment process is being led by the BC EAO in a substituted process. The LAO website indicates that evaluation of the Project was completed on January 8, 2017 and that a review is now in progress. This is the first time the Haida Nation has been consulted regarding the Project. We understand that it is the view of both CEAA and BC EAO that Haida Gwaii is outside the spatial boundaries and scope of this project. We disagree with this perspective. Haida Gwaii and the Haida Nation will be affected by the proposed Project and the consultation process is too late to meet the Crown's duty to accommodate Haida concerns. Our reasons are set out below, together with our recommendation regarding the means by which to develop a legally sufficient consultation and accommodation process. Many of the concerns and deficiencies raised in this letter are consistent with those submitted by the Haida Nation in relation to the Pacific Northwest LNG proposal in March 2016 (which also did not include Haida Gwaii within the scope of the environmental assessment).</p> <p>We begin with some context on the scope of consultation and accommodation required. The Supreme Court Of Canada has held in a number of that and accommodation must responsive to, and engage in meaningful dialogue about the Haida Nation's concerns, and must be proportionate to the strength of Haida Title and Rights. In Haida Nation v. BC, the Supreme Court of Canada assessed the strength of Haida Title and Rights and stated they were "supported by a good prima facie case" and that significant accommodation may be required to preserve the Haida interests pending final resolution of the Haida Title, through litigation or negotiation. The Supreme Court of Canada has also repeatedly emphasized the importance of reconciliation. The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has also emphasized the concept of Reconciliation as a Relationship<sup>1</sup>. The framework for strategic and operational decisions in relation to Haida Gwaii terrestrial and marine resources is contained in a number of reconciliation agreements between the federal and provincial Crown and the Haida Nation. These agreements include shorelines, marine spaces and species that are at risk of being adversely affected by the Project. Specifically, the 1993 Gwaii Haanas Agreement, the 2010 Gwaii Haanas Marine Agreement, the 2007 MOU for the SGaan Kinghlas (Bowie Seamount) Marine protected Area, the 2007 Strategic Land plan Agreement and 2009 Kunst'aa Guu-Kunst'aayah Reconciliation Protocol (the 'Agreements') all contain commitments to protect rare and sensitive areas for future generations, with the expectation, from both the Haida Nation and the Crown, that Haida Gwaii be collaboratively managed to a higher standard with a lower threshold of risk. The Project affects our ability to fulfill these commitments.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>The discussion of potential Project effects on Haida Nation rights and interests, Haida Gwaii and Dixon Entrance is beyond the scope of the environmental assessment for the Aurora LNG project as set out in the BC EAO's Section 11 Order (as amended), and the final approved Application Information Requirements for the Project. Aurora LNG will continue to follow the direction of the BC EAO and CEA Agency with regard to the scope of the environmental assessment process for the Aurora LNG project.</p>
1135 (2 of 4)	2017-03-09	Council of the Haida Nation - Haida Gwaii, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>The Agreements provide both substantive and procedural content to the Crown's duties, which were affirmed by the Federal Court in Moresby Explorers Ltd. v. Canada (Attorney General) and Council of the Haida Nation et al v Canada (Fisheries and Oceans), 2015 FC 290, It would be a fundamental breach of the Crown's three-fold duty of consultation, accommodation and reconciliation to the Haida Nation if the processes and higher standards for Crown conduct contained in the Agreements were not engaged in respect of the Project.</p> <p>The Haida Nation is particularly concerned about the impacts of the Project on cooperatively managed protected areas located throughout Haida territory that were not included in the scope of the environmental assessment. These include areas under the Agreements above, namely, the CHN-BC protected areas and Protection Management Zones (co-designated by BC), Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area Reserve and Haida Heritage Site (co-designated by Parks Canada), and SGaan Kinghlas Bowie Seamount Marine protected Area (co-designated by DFO). As indicated above, we have Agreements with the Province of BC, Parks Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada to cooperatively manage these areas that are vulnerable to shipping traffic and spills. All areas are co-designated by the Haida Nation as protected areas under Haida law. Threats to these areas were not considered in the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Report.</p> <p>The Draft EA Report had a number of serious deficiencies including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neither Aurora LNG nor the federal or provincial government has completed an environmental assessment of the specific impacts of the Project on Haida territory including on the marine waters, habitats and species important to the Haida, or the socio-economic conditions on Haida Gwaii and Haida culture. The decision to limit the scope of the EAO assessment to the area east of the Triple Island pilot boarding station is a serious flaw in the assessment and in meeting the federal Crown's duty to the Haida Nation.</li> <li>2. The Project Description indicates that Aurora LNG is considering the possibility of entering into the Technical Review process of Terminal Systems in Transshipment Sites (TERMPOL) for the marine shipping and marine terminal operations associated with the Project. In that event, we require that the scope of the assessment include Haida Gwaii and not be limited to the area east of the Triple Island pilot boarding station because an increase in shipping will have a major impact on Haida Gwaii and therefore Haida Gwaii must be included in both EAO and TERMPOL assessments. However, the TERMPOL process does not itself constitute an environmental assessment and would not address deficiencies in the EAO assessment related to Haida Gwaii. Of importance to the Haida Nation in regards to emergency preparedness and response, is the need for ocean-going rescue tug to permanently stationed on Haida Gwaii, an important consideration to mitigate risk to Haida Gwaii. Rescue tugs have been considered in other TERMPOL and can be addressed through implementation of the federal Oceans Protection Plan.</li> <li>3. A major gap in the assessment is that no baseline is provided about Haida Gwaii marine resources including fish, marine birds, marine mammals, marine invertebrates or marine plants or the socio-economic or cultural situation. This is in order to impacts of Project on Haida Gwaii and the Haida Nation.</li> </ol> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

1135 (3 of 4)	2017-03-09	Council of the Haida Nation - Haida Gwaii, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>4. The Project Description identifies that the Project will result in the emission of greenhouse gas (e.g., section 9.14-1.2). Further information is needed to assess the impact of atmospheric emissions relative to other projects. The greenhouse gas emissions would be continuous during Operations and are irreversible due to the persistence of CO2 in the atmosphere. This is not in the public interest as Canada is seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at the same time.</p> <p>5. Haida Gwaii and Dixon Entrance provide important habitat for internationally recognized populations of marine birds. The Project Description does not assess the impact of the project on marine birds beyond Triple Island. Dixon Entrance is a significant rearing and feeding areas for marine birds and will be negatively affected by Increased vessel traffic. Marine birds are particularly at risk if an oil spill occurs as a result of an LNG gas tanker casualty (see #9 below).</p> <p>6. Haida Gwaii and Dixon Entrance are also important habitat for many marine mammals, including species at risk. Humpback and fin whales are especial/ vulnerable to vessel strikes. Langara Island has been designated as critical habitat for humpback whales, which are a listed species. Marine mammals are also particularly vulnerable to oil spills (see #9 below).</p> <p>7. Haida Gwaii and Dixon Entrance support many species of marine fish, invertebrates and plants, and provides important marine habitat. The Project Description does not assess the impact of the Project and marine shipping on these important values.</p> <p>8. The Project Description does not include any assessment of the Project on socio-economic values or human health on Haida Gwaii. For instance the assessment should have considered impacts of potential spills on activities such as traditional food gathering, commercial and recreational fishing, and tourism on Haida Gwaii.</p> <p>9. The Project Description does not assess the potential for accidents such as grounding or collision or propose mitigation such as use of marine vessel pilots and tugs, collision prevention and navigation safety aids and cargo containment systems on gas tankers. Vessel surveillance is also not addressed other than mention of improvements in radar capability for vessels approaching the Port of Prince Rupert. Although accident prevention is an important consideration, the lack of access to salvage and limited response capacity to respond to oil spills also must be considered.</p> <p>10. Impacts of the project on Haida Gwaii as a result of marine shipping such as marine pollution or potential introduction of marine invasive species are not adequately addressed. Ballast water exchange and ship hulls are important vectors for the introduction of aquatic invasive species that are not mentioned in the Project Description. Existing regulations are not adequate to address our concerns as indicated by the introduction of the colonial tunicate <i>B. violaceus</i> to multiple locations in Haida Gwaii waters. Shipping is the most likely vector for introduction of this species and there are few controls to manage the spread once an alien species has been introduced and the effects can be irreversible.</p> <p>11. Neither the direct nor cumulative environmental effects of the Project have been assessed for Haida Gwaii. No estimates are provided about increases in shipping traffic. Cumulative effects are particularly important for species at risk present Haida Gwaii waters.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	
1135 (4 of 4)	2017-03-09	Council of the Haida Nation - Haida Gwaii, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>12. Shipping is a significant activity throughout the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) which includes both the assessment area and Haida Gwaii. Development of tools for assessing risks and cumulative effects has been identified as one of the priorities in the recently approved integrated management plan for PNCIMA. A pilot Ecosystem Risk Assessment Framework proposed for PNCIMA has been applied to Saan Kinghlas - Bowie Seamount and identified oil spills, aquatic invasive species and noise disturbance as high risk stressors to the natural environment as a result of shipping. These stressors apply throughout Haida Gwaii waters and have not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>13. The locations of where gas tankers in distress will be towed ("places of refuge") are a concern to the Haida Nation, because certain locations are particularly sensitive and could result in major environmental and cultural consequences.</p> <p>Finally, in addition to the deficiencies outlined above, the Haida Nation is concerned that the LNG gas tanker routes affect Haida Aboriginal Rights and Title over the lands and waters of Haida Gwaii. It is our view that the Crown's Obligations to the Haida Nation are significant given the strength of Haida Aboriginal Rights and Title; the Crown's knowledge of Haida Aboriginal Rights and Title in the face of an active Aboriginal Title lawsuit and other litigation; the importance of the marine environment and ecosystems to the Haida Nation; the high potential for long-lasting and permanent impacts to Haida Gwaii as a result of the Project; and the Crown's higher duties to the Haida Nation as a result of the existence of long-standing Agreements the Haida Nation and the Crown.</p> <p>The proposed public consultation process for the Project is not legally sufficient to meet the Crown's obligations to the Haida Nation, is not in keeping with the spirit and intent of Agreements, and is not in keeping with the Final Report and Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.</p> <p>We welcome an opportunity to meet and develop an appropriate and legally sufficient process to assess the impacts of the Project on Haida Gwaii and the Haida Nation.</p> <p>With due respect, Kil tlaats'gaa, Peter Lantin President of the Haida Nation Cc: Vivian Au, CEAA (Project Manager, Regional Operations, Pacific and Yukon) 1 Trust and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Final Report, Volume 6 (2015, Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication: Winnipeg)(the "TRC Final Report").</p>	
1136	2017-03-09	Margo Elfert - Richmond, British Columbia	<p>As a biologist who lived on Digby Island for many years, I understand what a great community it is, and how important the Skeena estuary is. Not only to the communities in the direct vicinity, but also to the communities up the Skeena who depend on this resource. I realize this is across from Lelu Island, but any disturbance in that area will have a negative effect on this productive but fragile ecosystem.</p> <p>To add insult to injury, I understand that the market for this resource (LNG) no longer really exists, so I am afraid that we will ruin this area before we realize how economically unprofitable it will be.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>

1137	2017-03-09	Lou Allison - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>March 9, 2017 For the Public Comment for the Proposed Aurora LNG Development from: Lou Allison, resident of Dodge Cove, Digby Island, BC</p> <p>RE: Dodge Cove as "vulnerable" and "non resilient" as identified in the EA</p> <p>The residents of Dodge Cove object to being characterized in these terms: over the last hundred plus years, the population of Dodge Cove has shown itself to be able to adapt to change and to remain vibrant within itself as a community, as well as providing a haven, long or short, for many people wishing to take a step out and back from their lives in other places.</p> <p>I assume that the terms refer to Dodge Cove residents as "vulnerable" and "non resilient" in relation to the Aurora LNG Project. I would like to turn the question around to: who would want a giant LNG facility next door? Who would want to adapt to change, unasked for and unwanted, on this scale?</p> <p>We don't. No one else would either. Does that make us non resilient? We are asked over and over to identify our concerns, to list our concerns, to discuss our concerns, to think about mitigation for our concerns. The repetition is tedious, for us and for everyone else. I think why we don't want the Aurora LNG facility next to us, on the Island we love, should be obvious.</p>	<p>Qualified conclusions stating that residents of Dodge Cove are more likely to realize higher magnitude effects (i.e., have low resiliency to change) than overall LAA populations is representative of the higher level of sensitivity of Dodge Cove with respect to potential Project-related effects. Noted in Table 6.2 with respect to infrastructure and services, resiliency refers to the capacity of existing services to accommodate increased demand. With respect to community health, resiliency refers to the capacity of community health (in this case within Dodge Cove) to recover from a perturbation, with consideration of existing level of disturbance to community health.</p>
1138	2017-03-09	Eoin Finn - Howe Sound, British Columbia	<p>I am opposed to your granting this plant an Environmental Certificate. For many reasons, including (principally):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Siting: Were Canada internationally-accepted siting standards, including the Industry's own (SIGTTO), locating this dangerous plant so close to human populations would have been disallowed well before this stage of the assessment as being far too great a threat.</li> <li>- Emissions: As shown in the attachment, direct GHG emissions from this facility, if gas-powered, will be in excess of 8.5 MTPA. Counting upstream emissions, that total is certain to exceed BC's entire 2030 GHG emissions budget and flies in the face of international commitments made in Paris at CoP21 in late 2015.</li> <li>- Fracking: BC's gas is currently sourced 75%+ from fracking operations, which are highly destructive to the ecological health of N.E. BC. Fracking operations permanently pollute scarce groundwater, trammel indigenous rights and title guaranteed by the Federal Government, and leave our Province open to ridicule on the international stage for failing to live up to its UNDRIP obligations</li> <li>- Economics: The economics of this industry are currently in tatters, and are certain to stay that way well into the next decade. Without the substantial financial assistance this BC Government has given the industry, such facilities would have gone away and scarce capital would be seeking greener pastures. The benefits to the local (BC) economy, given the tendency of such international investors to squirrel away profits to offshore tax havens, are minimal.</li> <li>- Renewables are the future, and will replace fossil fuels as our primary energy source. If we are to survive climate change, that must happen. Why we would bother to invest in yet another sunset industry and call that progress is beyond me. Australia's LNG nightmare - where it is currently importing LNG (at 3x the local price) because it has overcommitted its available gas resource to exports, should be a sobering lesson for BC.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, I feel that BC is proposing to develop this hazardous industry in an inappropriate location without first implementing a regime of regulations and regulatory oversight. These should be at least as rigorous as those in peer-group nations with more experience in LNG matters than Canada's. BC has not given sufficient regard to its environmental and safety consequences for Digby Island and its inhabitants. We contend that both the NEB and EA processes by which the project has proceeded to this point are deeply flawed, and I request that these processes be suspended and approval withheld until those flaws are corrected and the process is repeated from a point where decision data required for improved processes are gathered and examined in a rigorous, fair, transparent and objective process.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine potentially adverse effects of the project. To help companies choose potential locations for a LNG port facility and manage potential risks, the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO), of which the project partners are members, published a list of "general considerations" in 1997. According to SIGTTO, these considerations were meant as "basic guides to prompt special inquiry into particular aspects" (SIGTTO Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, 1997). Aurora LNG used the SIGTTO recommendations when choosing Digby Island as the site of our proposed facility. Aurora LNG also followed separate guidelines established by the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC). In choosing Digby Island as the proposed Aurora LNG site, location-specific risks were identified, these risks will undergo further assessment to determine appropriate mitigation measures as part of the engineering design phase. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience to further reduce the potential for any incidents and ensure safety is maintained. Aurora LNG will comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements regarding safety and facility siting, including any required safety zones. The GHG emission magnitude quantified in the Application have been incorporated in the significance statement related to the release of GHGs from the Project. However, Aurora LNG cannot comment on how BC and Canada will meet their GHG reduction commitments. Provincial and Federal GHG reduction commitments are impacted by numerous factors outside of the scope of this Project. Therefore, such an evaluation is outside of the scope of the GHG assessment.</p> <p>In response to the economics section of this comment, the Project's economic benefits are discussed in Section 1.4 of the Application. These include substantial employment opportunities for Canadians (and more specifically, residents of northwest BC) during construction and operations, business opportunities for Canadian firms, and government revenues, including consumption taxes, income taxes, and property taxes. In addition to direct economic effects, the Project will result in indirect economic effects due to purchases by suppliers of firms, who sell goods and services directly to the Project (i.e., indirect effects), as well as from expenditures by the Project's workforce (induced effects).</p> <p>In response to "Renewables", BC LNG has been identified by Provincial Regulators to be a viable transitional fuel, meaning it can help reduce carbon emissions now while powering the shift to renewable energy. Therefore, advancements in BC LNG can assist global commitments in reducing CO2 emissions. Aurora LNG believes that the environmental assessment is a robust Application which provides sufficient and accurate baseline and effects assessment information to enable the BC Environmental Assessment Office and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to make a well informed decision towards the approval process. Any further questions regarding the EA process should be directed to the BC EAO or CEAA.</p>

1139 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>The reports from the residents in Rosspport are heartbreaking. There is no reason that these terminals need to be placed so close to communities. The reports from Dodge Cove, Canada are going to be just as heartbreaking if the Aurora LNG terminal is approved. This will be another black mark on the management of this country, this location is not necessary any way you look at it.</p> <p>"The flaming began in November and ran through into January. The flaring was part of the testing process for the plant, ahead of first gas coming ashore."</p> <p>"the parish newsletter, "saying that all our troubles were over, that we had been saved at last, gas coming and money. They had no idea."</p> <p>The population is split in 3 - "those who saw the dangers, and voiced their opposition; those who considered the issue from a business perspective and supported it; and then "the mass of those who were concerned, but not enough to say anything about it."</p> <p>"the community were hungry for jobs, to try to keep the youth, and they didn't think about the flares or pollution."</p> <p>People trusted those behind the project. "And that trust was manipulated, and destroyed."</p> <p>The company, Shell, admits there was more flaring than "initially envisaged."</p> <p>"I have no problem with Shell. I expect a dog to bark. But we do expect the government and the official agencies to do their jobs."</p> <p>"Right from the beginning , they say it was about health and safety. Not gas. It was about health and safety in a small, rural, aging community, a knot of people in a sprawling, beautiful but mostly empty part of the western seaboard, conscious of their rights as citizens."</p> <p>"It was their land, their livelihoods, their community they felt were under threat. What about the alternative plan for the terminal to have been built in a much quieter area some 20 km away? Couldn't there have been another way?"</p> <p>"They are concerned about pollution, accidents, the fear of a potential disaster. (Now that the gas is going in right beside their homes) "how can we relax and say this is over?"</p> <p>"The time taken up with learning and working about a subject that I have no interest in the wide earthly world in."</p> <p><a href="http://www.irishexaminer.com/viewpoints/analysis/corrib-controversy-gas-flow-not-the-end-of-communities-struggle-331185.html">http://www.irishexaminer.com/viewpoints/analysis/corrib-controversy-gas-flow-not-the-end-of-communities-struggle-331185.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FtIjMHRFrO4">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FtIjMHRFrO4</a></p> <p><a href="http://documentarylovers.com/film/pipe-down/">http://documentarylovers.com/film/pipe-down/</a></p> <p>Dick Spring - 20th October 1987 – then leader of the Labour Party on the introduction of the giveaway terms introduced by Ray Burke which were subsequently improved (for the oil companies) 5 years later by Bertie Ahern.</p> <p>"We will now, as a result of the changes this Government have made, get absolutely no return whatever from the development of any foreseeable oil find .....</p> <p>What is most serious about this development is that there has been, up to now, a certain level of national consensus about how we should view our natural resources — even parties that did not really believe it were prepared to pay lip service to the notion that the natural resources of Ireland belonged to the people of Ireland. In the breaking of that consensus, and in their cold-blooded decision to give those resources away, Fianna Fáil have committed what I have already described as an act of economic treason, one for which I believe they should not be forgiven by the young people and by the people at large."</p> <p><a href="http://www.shelltosea.com/content/just-how-bad-irelands-oil-gas-deal">http://www.shelltosea.com/content/just-how-bad-irelands-oil-gas-deal</a></p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges receipt of the quoted case study materials. Responses to overarching themes presented in the comment as identified through these case studies are provided below.</p> <p>Benefits of the Project, such as employment (at the provincial and federal level), contributions to the BC and Canadian economies as well as training and education initiatives are described in Sections 1.4 of the Application (Benefits of the Proposed Project). Estimates of regional hire and spending and associated changes in labour supply and demand and changes in activities for commercial businesses affected by Project spending are provided in Sections 5.2.5.1 and 5.2.5.2 respectively.</p> <p>Despite the above referenced benefits, Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could potentially affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated.</p> <p>However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community.</p> <p>For information on effects related to emergency flaring see Section 9.7 'LNG Plant Malfunctions'. Also, see the technical memo 'Additional Visual Quality Renderings' for simulated renderings of emergency flaring events.</p>
1139 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>Pat "Chief" O'Donnell, a fisherman from Rosspport, was immediately wary of the environmental impacts of such a project on an area famed for its natural beauty. "I was worried from the beginning," he told me. "When I got the environmental impact statement in early 2000, I thought, 'this is colossal'. It seemed like they wanted to build a monster in the middle of a palace. It was going to destroy our home and my livelihood."</p> <p>But the fisherman could never have imagined the devastating impact the Corrib gas project would have on this once close-knit community.</p> <p>The David and Goliath story wasn't always told in the media, which came in for criticism for failing to portray the protesters fairly. "We were made out to be criminals, every element of the state was behind Shell. I was so naive I really thought someone would pay attention and see this for what it was – a small community defending itself," Pat said.</p> <p>Pat O'Donnell reflected on the innocence of the remote village: "We were so naive...And for what? For protecting the land we love? For not wanting huge companies to destroy our home?"</p> <p>"I was travelling with my son last night and we saw huge flares in the distance, which shows they're testing flaring now." Pat told me. "Massive flames in the sky, but if we burn a bit of rubber out the back we'd have the Gardai down on us straight away. If they had to kill people to get this through they would. Anything to clear the way," he said."</p> <p><a href="https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/rossport-gas-exploitation-protests-209">https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/rossport-gas-exploitation-protests-209</a></p> <p>Does Canada know its resource of oil and gas?</p> <p>The Norwegian government (in 1958) did not know, but it still had a much different attitude and did not adopt a "civil servant attitude".</p> <p>That same attitude cannot be said (being able to dictate terms to the oil and gas companies) with the way this industry is handled in Canada. We are in a position where we own our resources, and we are in a position as a country where we can dictate to the oil and gas industry. If this is not true, then why not?</p> <p>Norway considered it strategically important to ensure Norwegian sovereignty over its rich resources. Why is Canada not thinking that this is equally important? Canada should be learning from all the countries that are mismanaging their resources and NOT following in those countries footsteps.</p>	
1140	2017-03-09	Dodge Cove Improvement District - Dodge Cove	See attached document from Dodge Cove Improvement District	Please see the "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO. The "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to the Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo was presented to the Working Group in draft for pre-read on April 17, 2017 under the title of "Air Quality Figures, Datasets and a Comparison to PRAS."
1141	2017-03-09	Bill Troughton - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	The winds on the south end of Digby island regularly reach 90 miles per hour.I just want the powers that be to know that when these huge ships are jammed on the rocks and across the harbor entrance that many fisherman like myself new this disaster was going to happen. How come i don't here about the reality of Rapid Phase Transition Explosions anymore.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1142	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I have DEEP concern with LNG development on our beautiful BC coast and natural gas extraction period. The environmental impacts are NOT worth it. This particular plant threatens the livelihood of many coastal people. I DO NOT support LNG in BC. We need to move towards renewables! Geothermal, solar, wind, tidal.... there are so many options to invest in, lets invest in the future, not an outgoing way of thinking. There is no silver bullet solution but there are A LOT of solutions out there! Save our beautiful coast line for tourism, fisheries, biodiversity, and stability. No one pays to come to BC to see industry, they can get that anywhere. Please don't spoil what we have left.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.

1143 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	LJ Moore - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Public comment to EAO re: Aurora LNG EA application Submitted by: Laura Moore, Dodge Cove resident, Digby Island, BC</p> <p>I have come to the conclusion that the Aurora LNG if built at this location on Digby Island would significantly compromise the health and well-being of the residents of Dodge Cove, Metlakatla and the Fairview and Westview areas of Prince Rupert. Between the poorly chosen site in the Skeena River Estuary ,with their Project boundary overlapping the communities official boundary, the high volume of toxic emissions, the noise from all the blasting, heavy equipment and helicopter traffic during construction, the danger of a lethal gas leak during operations, the Marine Offloading Facility proposed for Casey Cove for transporting and dumping of toxic materials and dredgeate, of garbage incinerators from a 3000-man camp less than 1 km from the quiet and presently healthy community of Dodge Cove and an industrial highway in the communities watershed. I object to Nexen's conclusions that through mitigation and monitoring there will be no significant effects.</p> <p>With the further destruction of critical eelgrass in Delusion Bay and with it salmon, cod, steelhead, crab and shrimp habitat; the elimination of all freshwater streams within 900hectares of the shoreline that makes Spire Ledge such a great fishing spot; the blasting and dredging, continuous lighting and tanker traffic for 30+ years and just 2 miles from the already-approved PNWLNG facility on Lelu Island; another nail in the coffin of the Skeena River estuary ecosystem with its rich and diverse life would be cruelly hammered home.</p> <p>Consider the frequency of flaring which the Aurora application is very vague about and the fact that they plan to power their massive LNG facility (x4 the size of Woodfibre) with natural gas, adding even more to BC's GHG emissions. The proximity of the proposed power plant to Dodge Cove properties is only 750 meters. Imagine standing at the fence beside the Vancouver airport runway: the 2 generators would sound like a boeing 747 at take-off volume, 24 hours per day, 7 days a week, 365 days per year. That would be the magnitude of the sound in the community.</p> <p>Nexen has also down-played and insufficiently informed the public regarding the hazardous characteristics of liquefied natural gas (LNG) and the effects it could have if there was an accident or malfunction so close to human populations and wildlife. Their application fails to describe worst-case scenarios. They also don't disclose major accidents, even disasters that have happened nor incidents where evacuations were necessary. What actually happens when there is a small leak, a medium leak, a big leak? All they say is that LNG does not explode and that the risks are "relatively" low. If it doesn't explode what exactly does it do? What is a flash freeze, how does asphyxiation occur in the case of a leak and what is a pool fire? Nowhere in the application are these mentioned or described. Why do Sandia and SIGTTO recommend 3km distances from communities and describe hazard zones and exclusion zones of 500 to 3000meters? Neither has Nexen formulated an Emergency Response Plan nor an evacuation plan. They have not addressed the fiscal condition of the area, i.e. the relationship between the cost of services required to meet the health and safety needs of the population and the robustness of the tax base available to finance those services. The region does not have a large enough tax base to support large investments into hazardous materials response equipment. It is difficult to estimate the cost for coordinated emergency planning but it could easily run into millions. Who would pay? Who would be held responsible? Where is the transparency? And the public is supposed to trust in this process?</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment so that the potential effects of the Project would not be underestimated. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our emissions and overall environmental footprint.</p> <p>When choosing the Digby Island site for assessment, we consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt special enquiry into particular aspects." We have identified a number of location-specific risks and will create management strategies to safely mitigate each one.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience.</p> <p>LNG is extremely safe. An LNG facility is not like a refinery; it is essentially a large refrigerator, the primary purpose of which is to cool natural gas to the point where it becomes a liquid (~ minus 162°C). Factors contributing to the LNG industry's long-standing safety record include engineering design and construction of the LNG carrier cargo containment systems, equipment maintenance planning, industry standards, regulatory oversight, and personnel training in the context of applicable operational procedures.</p> <p>A detailed Emergency Response Plan and an Environmental Management Plan will be created, drawing on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as the partners' decades of global experience. As well, standard best management practices will be followed and we will implement a number of measures to prevent and mitigate accidents and malfunctions.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG plant will meet stringent regulations, standards and codes, and implement controlled ignition, gas leak detection, fire control and fire suppression technologies. Safety management systems, operating procedures, and risk assessments will be used to identify potential hazards and the safety measures required to protect facility personnel, equipment and the environment.</p> <p>Key safety-related equipment for emergency purposes will include shutdown and depressurization systems, fire protection, and safety flare systems (including flare stacks). A safety-instrumented system (including a combination of manual and automatic shutdown and gas depressurization processes) will be used at each LNG process train and the ship-loading facilities to manage the safety, shutdown and gas depressurization processes.</p> <p>Fire protection and safety measures (operating procedures and emergency response plans) will be used to protect personnel and equipment. Response equipment such as fire and gas detection systems, alarms, fire extinguishers, foam systems, firewater pumps, fire response vehicles, personal protective equipment, monitors, and passive protection will be provided onsite, at appropriate locations.</p>
1143 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	LJ Moore - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>In the more than 50 years since the first shipment of LNG to overseas markets, more than 33,000 LNG carrier voyages have covered more than 241 million kilometres (the equivalent of more than 6,000 trips around the earth) without incident (Source: The International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers). Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of mitigation measures to further reduce the potential for any incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1144	2017-03-09	LJ Moore - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>To EAO, Public Comment re: Aurora LNG EA application Submitted by: LJ Moore, Dodge Cove, Digby Island, BC</p> <p>As well as being a health hazard to local residents, the Aurora LNG facility proposed for Digby Island would pose a considerable risk to other marine traffic using the Prince Rupert harbour entrance at the south end of Digby Island. In its application, Nexen provides no baseline data to account for present volumes of marine traffic . With 3 major ferries on scheduled runs to Haida Gwaii, Alaska and Port Hardy, container ship traffic, grain, coal and soon propane, tugs, barges and other commercial and freighter traffic plus a still-substantial fleet of fishing boats, local small vessel traffic, pleasure craft, sports fishing boats, kayakers and whale-watching vessels passing through the entrance; Prince Rupert harbour is a busy place. With a loading time of between 12 and 24 hours per LNG carrier at the rate of between 160 LNG carriers (2 trains) and 320 LNG carriers(4 trains at full build-out) per year to be loaded at a proposed jetty on Fredrick Point from a pipeline offshore at the narrow and dangerous entrance to Prince Rupert Harbour and with a 500 meter exclusion zone: not much time or space left for others to pass at a safe distance and enter the harbour Meanwhile, the federal government has plans to hand over the regulating and monitoring to the proponent and a port authority "regime" whose mandate is to promote big industries such as LNG. What about the rest of us?</p> <p>"Locations that already attract other craft, including pleasure craft and fishing vessels, are inherently unsuitable for LNG terminals. In such circumstance enforcement of the exclusion zone is highly problematical and, even with enforcement effort, may ultimately fail." And "Port designers should be directed to construct jetties handling hazardous cargoes in remote areas where other ships do not pose a collision risk and where any gas escape cannot affect local populations" (Both quotes are from the Society of International Gas Terminals and Tanker Operators (SIGTTO) Standards.</p> <p>Alternatives: Offshore terminals are becoming a reality. Enhances safety and security by keeping a buffer to infrastructure and population, avoids port related vessel traffic, weather delay and daylight restrictions, reduces onshore and nearshore impacts of dredging and site prep and allows projects to target specific markets where supply is needed. All the components for the facility are coming from China.The camp would be FIFO (fly-in-fly-out) with only 5-10% local employees and any of the hired locals would be on 2 week shifts and locked in for that time, same as the rest of the workers, so why put it on Digby Island anyways?</p> <p>Fact evasion, controversial assumptions used in modelling, a patchwork assembly of baseline data for valued components or sometimes no baselines at all, no answers to valid and serious questions: Where is the logic in fast-tracking a project of this magnitude when there are so many omissions in the application and so much at risk in its approval?</p>	<p>Data on shipping traffic is provided in Section 6.5.3 of the Application (Existing Conditions for Marine Use and Navigable Waters). Additional discussion of small vessel traffic is included in the supplemental technical memo titled "Small Craft Assessment" which will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>The application of the proposed control zones would still allow approximately 800 m channel width available for navigation (northern berth), and 1300 m of available channel (southern berth) - see Figure 6.5.2. By comparison, the narrowest natural channel width between Digby and Kaien islands is approximately 600 m.</p> <p>With respect to the SIGTTO, the document entitled "Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties" (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In this regard, this guidance document does not identify exclusion zones, rather it focuses on identifying design considerations for jetty safety and presents a series of risk reduction options, which, in relation to jetty location, includes the recommendation that jetties be located away from populated areas and removed from other marine traffic and port activity.</p> <p>This SIGTTO guidance also promotes a flexible approach to jetty location that is focused on a localized determination based on the specific circumstances associated with the proposed facility and identifies measures (e.g. static and dynamic mooring analysis and the collection of site specific wind /wave data) that could be employed to reduce potential location risk. Aurora LNG is therefore of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance.</p>
1145	2017-03-09	Laurie Parkinson - Bowyer Island, Howe Sound, British Columbia	<p>There is presently a significant oversupply of LNG in the world. The global oversupply is becoming larger, soon to be 2x what is needed. The US got the jump on Canada re LNG plants because they used to have lots of LNG import plants. These import plants are being retrofitted to be LNG export plants. It makes no sense for BC to be planning any new LNG plants.</p>	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>



1146	2017-03-09	Laurie Parkinson - Bowyer Island, Howe Sound, British Columbia	Contrary to what the BC government says, oil and gas are not significant employers in BC. They only provide about 3% of the jobs. Yet the BC government can't seem to find enough subsidies to give the hopeful LNG export industry. Historically subsidies are paired with with a company providing lots of jobs. LNG plants hire a few hundred people directly, long term. Big mines hire several thousand people directly, long term. Both receive subsidies. The BC government can't seem to find enough subsidies to give the LNG industry. Most recently it's eDrive rate, and shortly after that, no resource co, including LNG, has to pay PST on electricity. This puts a lot of responsibility for BC taxes on the average citizen, not on LNG companies. It would be ok if LNG plants hired masses of people like big mines do. But LNG companies hire a very small number of people long term. Oil and gas provide 3% of BC's jobs. This doesn't make sense	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1147	2017-03-09	Laurie Parkinson - Bowyer Island, Howe Sound, British Columbia	All of the hopeful LNG export plants, including Aurora, are owned by multinational companies. They all have their ownership set up so there is an offshore company and a local company. The offshore company buys the natural gas and sells the LNG - and pays taxes overseas, not to BC or Canada. BC also doesn't charge PST on natural gas exported. So we won't get the usual taxes for roads and schools from Aurora or any other LNG plant. This is very poor return for the small number of long term jobs that come from LNG plants.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1148	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	I am submitting this report on Canada's oceans - I feel that it is very relevant to the Aurora LNG final application and the effects that will be felt by CNOOC-Nexens' proposal for the Skeena River estuary. I feel that the BCEAO should read this report and include it while reviewing whether or not the Aurora LNG project should be approved. <a href="http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0012182&amp;type=printable">http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0012182&amp;type=printable</a>	Aurora LNG thanks the respondent for this information. We are aware of the reference provided, and acknowledge the biodiversity not just of Canada's oceans, but specifically of the coastal area in and around the region of the proposed Project. Aurora LNG's approach to focusing on key aspects of this biodiversity was to implement standard environmental assessment methodology, in which valued components are identified based on their ecological and social importance. With respect to marine biodiversity, the most relevant valued components are; 1) water quality, (Section 4.05, specifically 4.5.11 onwards); 2) marine fish and fish habitat (Section 4.9), 3) marine mammals (Section 4.10), and, 4) marine birds (Section 4.11). Within these valued components, the environmental assessment focuses on key potential effects, which help to focus the assessment on important ways in which these components could be harmed by the Project. For instance, for marine fish and fish habitat, Aurora LNG considered potential effects of; change in habitat; change in behaviour; change in mortality risk; and change in health. Consequently, Aurora LNG has adopted an approach to the environmental assessment that not only acknowledges the biodiversity of marine life in and around the Project area, but explicitly incorporates it into the Application structure and focuses on the important ways in which components of this biodiversity could potentially be affected.
1149	2017-03-09	Karen Antonsen - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	No LNG Terminal on Digby Island. This way too close to Dodge Cove and the city of Prince Rupert.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1150	2017-03-09	Laurie Parkinson - Bowyer Island, Howe Sound, British Columbia	About 3/4 of the natural gas that BC extracts and uses comes from fracking. With the increased fracking from LNG export, soon 100% will come from fracking. Fracking often results in contamination of ground water with a cocktail of toxic chemicals that can be trade secrets of the fracking co. These chemicals are injected into the ground using a large amount of fresh water, which becomes permanently contaminated, removed from the hydro-logical cycle. I expect you have also heard of the earthquakes from fracking. Have you heard of the natural gas (methane) that leaks out of the ground, with fracking? Methane is a very powerful greenhouse gas - much worse than carbon dioxide. It leaks from the ground, from poor joins in the pipes, from the LNG plant, and from tankers as they go overseas. If old tankers are used, they have to vent warmed LNG (methane) as they cross the ocean, for safety reasons. So, according to David Hughes, highly respected Canadian geoscientist, BC LNG is 27% worse re greenhouse gasses than the best coal burning technology China can build. BC is not slowing climate change with an LNG export industry.	Hydraulic fracturing ("fracking") operations occur upstream of the Project and outside of the scope of the Aurora LNG GHG Assessment (Section 4.3 of the Application). Aurora LNG has also completed an Upstream GHG Emissions Report at the request of Environment and Climate Change Canada which has been filed with the BC EAO. Aurora LNG cannot comment on the activities conducted by or practices by other proponents operating in the upstream oil and gas production sector. Methane fugitive leaks and venting have been identified in the Application (refer to Chapter 4.3). Potential for fugitive emissions will be reduced by the design of the facility. This following design features will be considered during facility front end engineering and design: welded connections on cryogenic piping to reduce the use of flanges where feasible (and where access for maintenance is not required) ; using dry seals in compression systems, where applicable. Aurora LNG will be designed to minimize potential venting sources through the use of pneumatic devices powered by compressed air instead of natural gas. Potential venting emissions from storage tanks and the marine berth loading area will be captured and sent to the facility fuel system or the flare if necessary. Therefore, venting emissions are predicted to be negligible and thus excluded from the assessment.
1151	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	I am very much against LNG. Digby Island is a vital community that would be destroyed If LNG got the go ahead. Please, Please, Please, say NO to LNG.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.
1152	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Gabriola, British Columbia	The people and the whole coastline do not want this to be built. It will enrich the foreign buyers and leave nothing but a toxic environment for we the people to live with, and our decision makers will be far away spending their bonuses for letting this happen. Look at the facts....businesses get their way by political donations, and we get nothing but their mess to live with. I say NO.	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1153	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	See attached document (public_comment_1153)	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges the information presented in the comment. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine the potentially adverse effects of the project and to identify appropriate measures to avoid or lessen these potential adverse effects.
1154	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	Please save the livelihood of the communities that have lived on Digby island for generations. Dodge Cove is home to my common law partner and has been part of their family for over 20 years. Aside from the communities, the fragile and rare ecosystems are home to important species, animals and mammals that are at risk if an LNG plant is developed. Thank you	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.

1155 (1 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	See attached document (public_comment_1155)	<p>Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine and potentially adverse effects of the project including effects on the community of Dodge Cove and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>As part of the Environmental Assessment process, Aurora LNG has examined potential adverse effects of the Project on, but not limited to; marine and wetland habitat; marine fish and marine mammals; wildlife; air; water; economic conditions; visual quality; infrastructure and services; marine and land use; community health; noise; and traditional land use. In all of these areas, potential adverse project effects were avoided or managed with the implementation of planned mitigation measures.</p> <p>Siting: With respect to safety and facility siting, Aurora LNG will comply with all applicable federal and provincial requirements, including any required safety zones. In this regard, Aurora LNG notes that in addition to obtaining an Environmental Assessment Certificate, the proposed Project will also require an LNG Facility Permit from the OGC (as well as other construction and environmental authorizations). LNG Facility Permits are regulated by the OGC under the Oil and Gas Activities Act and associated Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Regulation, which requires that the engineering and design for an LNG facility be completed in accordance with Canadian Standards Association CSA Z276 (Liquefied natural gas (LNG) - Production, storage, and handling) or that a qualitative risk assessment be performed to support any deviations.</p> <p>SIGTTO: With respect to the SIGTTO, the document entitled Site Selection and Design Guidelines for LNG Ports and Jetties (August 2000 reprint) provides siting guidance that is focused on jetty location. In this regard, this guidance document does not identify exclusion zones, rather it focuses on identifying design considerations for jetty safety and presents a series of risk reduction options, which, in relation to jetty location, includes the recommendation that jetties be located away from populated areas and removed from other marine traffic and port activity. This SIGTTO guidance also promotes a flexible approach to jetty location that is focused on a localized determination based on the specific circumstances associated with the proposed facility and identifies measures (e.g. static and dynamic mooring analysis and the collection of site specific wind /wave data) that can be employed to reduce location risk. Aurora LNG is of the view that its current facility siting, including the jetty location is consistent with available SIGTTO guidance.</p> <p>Benefits of the Project and Economic Conditions: Regarding the location of accrual for Project expenditures, Section 1.4.3 of the Application (Benefits of the Proposed Project – Project Costs) provides estimates of construction spending by location (i.e., BC, other Canada, and international). Information on labour income is provided in Section 1.4.4 (Benefits of the Proposed Project – Employment). Assessment of local and regional economic effects related to Project expenditures and hiring is provided in Section 5.2 of the Application (Economic Conditions).</p> <p>Marine Navigation: Section 6.5 Marine Use and Navigable Waters assesses changes in marine navigation (which includes consideration of safety). Noted in Section 6.5.5.2, All of the Project's in-water infrastructure is located outside of the main shipping route area and only 2% lies within the small vessel corridor. With Project infrastructure in place (and including control zones), the width of the channel will be approximately 900 m wide at the narrowest part.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>
1155 (2 of 2)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia		<p>By comparison, the entrance to the Burrard Inlet (Vancouver, BC) at First Narrows is approximately 450 m wide, while the Second Narrows is approximately 350 m wide, yet large and small vessels operate safely and efficiently. Docking LNG carriers will take approximately 30 minutes with the assistance of four tugs. The Prince Rupert Port Authority (PRPA) will continue to coordinate large vessel traffic so that turning will not affect other large vessels (i.e., the PRPA can request that other vessels modify their speed so as to avoid entering or exiting the port while a turning and docking process is underway). Finally, the existing and proposed traffic management and navigation, safety, and security procedures implemented by the PRPA, Pacific Pilotage Authority, Canadian Coast Guard, Transport Canada, and the RCMP will mitigate potential residual effects on marine navigation. Overall, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the Project will result in low magnitude residual effects on marine navigation.</p> <p>Additional information on marine navigation is also available in the technical memo's "Effects of Additional Project-related Traffic", "Navigational Sight Line and Glare Effects", and "Small Craft Assessment". These technical memos will be filed with the BC EAO.</p> <p>Quality of Life/Community Identity and Social Cohesion: Aurora LNG acknowledges that the Project could affect the quality of life/community identity and social cohesion of the community of Dodge Cove. Noted in Section 13.5 of the Application, given the relatively small size of the community of Dodge Cove and its proximity to the project development area (PDA), changes to perceived quality of life and community identity for residents (e.g., through changes in access to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, visual quality at key viewpoints, and sense of privacy) is anticipated.</p> <p>However, with respect to preferred recreational sites and natural areas, based on the results of the assessment, the project is not anticipated to change or disrupt present land use capability to a point where activities cannot continue at or near current levels. Aurora LNG plans to work with community organizations to identify the appropriate enhancement and development of recreational areas on Digby Island, such as trails and picnic areas, to address removal and/or degradation of recreational areas potentially caused by the project. With respect to visual quality, the results of our assessment show that the project will not result in an overall change in visual character of the local area, and the effects on visual quality are predicted to be not significant. In designing the facility and associated infrastructure, we have sought to minimize visual impacts through the use of existing terrain and by retaining vegetation buffer zones.</p> <p>Outstanding community concerns regarding changes to perceived quality of life may continue, despite the implementation of mitigation measures. Aurora LNG will continue to consult with Dodge Cove residents to identify and help reduce Project-related adverse effects on their quality of life and sense of community. For additional information regarding Project effects and issues on quality of life/community identity, social cohesion, private property values, and cost of living please refer to Section 13.5 of the Application.</p> <p>Accidents or Malfunctions: Information on accidents and malfunctions is provided in Section 9 of the Application. Assessed scenarios include; motor vehicle collisions, facility impact from aircraft, on-shore fires or explosions, LNG plant malfunctions, on-shore hazardous spills, vessel grounding or collision, and LNG release at the loading facility. Where relevant, a discussion of effects on local and regional emergency services is provided.</p>

1156	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Public Comment Aurora LNG March 09, 2017</p> <p>It is very unfortunate that the proponents Nexen and Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation, have been allowed to enter into a Provincial Environmental Review with such large gaps in their proposal for their LNG terminal. One of the biggest problems facing Canada and the world is the GHG emissions that are being released into the atmosphere. The Federal Government required the proponent to report not just the construction and production emissions but also the upstream emissions. During most of the public comment period, the public and stakeholders had no access to total emissions as requested, so all studies and participants of the working group were using figures, which did not reveal the true emissions. This is only one example of much unfinished research and large gaps in areas that are more obvious to the citizens that use the local land and water in sustainable ways.</p> <p>Under CONCLUSIONS in the application, 4.3.10, Nexen, claims that "During full build out operations, annual GHG emissions are conservatively estimated to be 6,669,335 (6.7 mt) tonnes CO2e per year." Wow, this is a very conservative number. PNW-LNG is a plant with a proposal of less production annually and the indication is that they would be producing 13.9 million tonnes of CO2 annually. Why would they use a conservative number in their application, when they had not even reported their upstream emissions?</p> <p>Now let's recap. PNW is to produce less CO2 annually and yet shows double the CO2 emissions of Aurora? This is indeed conservative data by Nexen and could be seen as false figures if both corporations are using the same formulas for determination of the totals. Also who determines these formulas to obtain the carbon equivalents. It seems that much of the data seems biased towards the industry, or shall I say the data is just "conservative".</p> <p>The Pembina Institute reports that the emissions of PNW would be one of the highest producers of all projects in Canada. I use PNW as my project for comparison due to its similar but smaller production. It has been projected that with upstream emissions, Aurora LNG would produce approximately 91 million tonnes from extraction to burning annually. Then let's say it is not a conservative estimate such as Nexen-CNOOC uses but a "bullish" estimate. The next comparison comes to the CO2 data from Canadian government sources:</p> <p>British Columbia: in 2005 - 62 mt (million tonnes) annually  2020 (projected) - 69 mt  2030 (projected) - 43 mt</p> <p>Between 2020 and 2030 British Columbia needs to drop 26 million tonnes (approx. 30%).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will this province reduce its carbon emissions by 30% in ten years if Aurora LNG is producing more than the total CO2 emissions of the whole province?</li> <li>2. How is it that after 3 large CO2 emitting fossil fuel projects like Kinder Morgan, Fibrewood LNG and LNG Canada (Kitimat), that the PNW and Aurora LNG can even be invited to lease and begin environmental reviews?</li> </ol> <p>The Paris Climate agreement that the Canadian Government committed to means Canadian CO2 emissions need to be reduced by 30% also between 2005 and 2030. Talk is cheap but commitments take careful planning and certainly not building CO2 emitting projects that top all others in their emissions. NO means NO and REDUCE means REDUCE not REPRODUCE!!!</p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges the concerns expressed by this comment.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is not able to provide detailed comment on statements pertaining to PNW LNG.</p> <p>Aurora LNG is unable to locate many of the referenced emissions totals cited in this comment. In Table 4.3-8 of the Application, the proposed LNG facilities in BC are identified. PNW LNG and the Aurora LNG are predicted to have similar GHG emission intensities.</p> <p>The methods used for GHG calculations are either approved in the Western Climate Initiative (WCI) Reporting Requirements recognized by BC Regulators or Industry best practices for emission calculations.</p> <p>Provincial and Federal GHG reduction commitments are impacted by numerous factors outside of the scope of this Project environmental assessment. Therefore, Aurora LNG cannot comment on if or how BC and Canada will meet these commitments if all of the proposed projects in BC are built (including Kinder Morgan, Fibrewood LNG, LNG Canada, PNW and Aurora LNG).</p>
1157	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	See attached document (public_comment_1157)	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concerns. Your contribution on Shannon LNG has been received and reviewed. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the Project and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment so that the potential Project effects would not be underestimated. We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and facility design process, with a goal to reduce our overall emissions and environmental footprint.</p> <p>When selecting the Digby Island site, Aurora LNG consulted the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) guidelines for site selection, which state "Criteria such as that for channel width should not be understood as absolute values; these recommendations are just basic guides to prompt further inquiry into particular aspects." We will create management strategies to safely mitigate location-specific risks.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience. Our facility will meet stringent safety regulations, standards and codes, and we will implement a number of proposed mitigation measures to further reduce the potential for incidents.</p> <p>We aspire to establish and build long-term, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with Aboriginal Groups, local communities and other stakeholders.</p>
1158	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Vancouver, British Columbia	How is it that this proposed lng terminal can be built 0.5 of a kilometer from the boundary of the community of Dodge Cove when the national standards say a facility of this size must be a minimum of 3.5 kilometers distance from populated areas?	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p>
1159	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	<p>The location is just too close to Dodge Cove. If Christy Clark had a vacation home there I'm sure this site would not have been suggested by the province. You're going to site a major industrial project a few hundred meters away from one of the most charming and historic communities on the coast. What is going to happen to people's property values? Who is going to want to move there with an LNG terminal literally in their backyard?</p> <p>Digby residents will also be sucking in the majority of emissions from this terminal. The airshed survey released last fall was unequivocal in that regard. You can't expect parents to raise children in that kind of environment. How do you plan to mitigate those impacts? How do you plan to protect those who can't afford the loss they'd take on their property from the long-term affects of breathing contaminated air?</p> <p>However, no matter what is said here, by me or anyone else, there's no doubt in my mind that the government will simply allow this project move forward, effectively destroying this wonderfully unique little community. It's a travesty and I will never forget what has been done to these good people's lives and their hopes for their futures.</p>	<p>The dispersion assessment presented in the Air Quality Technical Data Report (Appendix A of the Application) shows that the maximum predicted concentrations attributable to the proposed Aurora LNG Project do not occur on Digby Island near residents, but are localized in unoccupied portions of Kaien Island and Watson Island.</p> <p>The maximum potential exposure by a Digby Island resident to the predicted emissions from this facility are a small fraction of the most stringent air quality emission objectives.</p>
1160	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	No LNG on Digby Island or any where in B.C.	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>
1161	2017-03-09	Donna Polgar - Ladysmith, British Columbia	Please stop using our ocean and coastline to facilitate your LNG. There's more to life on our coast than supplying Asia with this product. Think about our ocean wildlife and the food we take from this wonderful ocean. Let's not let greed take over Canada.	<p>Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concern.</p>

1162 (1 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p>Report sheds new light on LNG blast in Algeria Apr 14, 2004 02:00 AM</p> <p>A newly released document provides important insights into the chain of events that led to the January explosion of a LNG facility in the African nation of Algeria. Several scientists who specialize in LNG research said the document indicates that a similar accident could occur at LNG plants like those proposed for Mobile Bay and elsewhere in the United States.</p> <p>Initial reports blamed a faulty steam boiler for the massive explosion and fire at the government-owned Skikda, Algeria, plant. Those reports were incorrect, according to the new document presented by Sonatrach, owner of the destroyed LNG plant. A display titled "The Incident at the Skikda Plant: Description and Preliminary Conclusions" indicates, instead, that a large amount of liquid gas escaped from a pipe and formed a cloud of highly flammable and explosive vapour that hovered over the facility. The cloud exploded after coming into contact with a flame source.</p> <p>The exact nature of the cloud is likely to be sharply debated as industry advocates and even a number of independent scientists have argued that an LNG vapour cloud, if it were to form, would be relatively small and would not explode. Most of the 27 people who died were killed by the force of the blast, according to the report. The report lists a "few casualties by fire," though the fire burned for eight hours.</p> <p>The Sonatrach report was presented at an international LNG conference held in the Middle Eastern nation of Qatar in late March. Officials with the US Department of Energy (DOE), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and ExxonMobil declined to discuss the document with the Mobile Register.</p> <p>In the days after the accident, officials with the DOE, FERC and ExxonMobil, as well as Alabama Port Authority director Jimmy Lyons, stressed that the explosion seemed to be entirely related to a malfunctioning boiler. LNG plants in the United States, they argued, would not have boilers like the ones used at the plant in Algeria, so a similar accident could not occur at an LNG facility in America.</p> <p>But several scientists who examined the new report told the Mobile Register that the type of accident described in it could occur at an LNG facility in this country, regardless of the type or number of boilers present. Almost any source of ignition, from a cigarette lighter to a pilot light, could have ignited a vapour cloud.</p> <p>ExxonMobil and Cheniere Energy have both proposed building LNG facilities on the shores of Mobile Bay, close to residential neighbourhoods. Both companies said their facilities would not impact nearby residents, even in the event of a catastrophic accident. ExxonMobil would place its plant on land owned by the Port Authority at the former Navy home port; Cheniere would build on Pinto Island.</p> <p>"I think this tells us that dealing with LNG is a tricky and dangerous business," said James Fay, professor emeritus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one of the nation's leading LNG scientists. "It was apparently a very large gas leak that went on for a while before the explosion. That certainly doesn't give you a lot of faith in their gas detection equipment, with all this gas leaking out. I guess this means sometimes that equipment doesn't work."</p> <p>Fay said the failure may have important implications for the siting criteria used by FERC when granting permits for new onshore LNG facilities. In particular, Fay said, FERC requires only that companies prove they can contain a vapour cloud and fire resulting from a 10-minute leak of LNG at the plant.</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Aurora LNG acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse Project effects and to determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.</p> <p>Aurora LNG employed a conservative approach throughout the environmental assessment so that the potential effects of the Project would not be underestimated.</p> <p>We will continue to assess new technologies and opportunities as we work through the assessment and design process, with a goal to reduce our overall emissions and environmental footprint.</p> <p>Safety is our top priority. Aurora LNG will draw on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry, as well as our Joint Venture partners' decades of global experience.</p> <p>LNG is extremely safe. An LNG facility is not like a refinery; it is essentially a large refrigerator, the primary purpose of which is to cool natural gas to the point where it becomes a liquid (~ minus 162°C). Factors contributing to the LNG industry's long-standing safety record include engineering design and construction of the LNG carrier cargo containment systems, equipment maintenance planning, industry standards, regulatory oversight, and personnel training in the context of applicable operational procedures.</p> <p>A detailed Emergency Response Plan and an Environmental Management Plan will be created, drawing on the comprehensive expertise of the LNG industry as well as the partners' decades of global experience. As well, standard best management practices will be followed and we will implement a number of measures to prevent and mitigate accidents and malfunctions.</p> <p>The Aurora LNG plant will meet stringent regulations, standards and codes, and implement controlled ignition, gas leak detection, fire control and fire suppression technologies. Safety management systems, operating procedures, and risk assessments will be used to identify potential hazards and the safety measures required to protect facility personnel, equipment and the environment.</p> <p>Key safety-related equipment for emergency purposes will include shutdown and depressurization systems, fire protection, and safety flare systems (including flare stacks). A safety-instrumented system (including a combination of manual and automatic shutdown and gas depressurization processes) will be used at each LNG process train and the ship-loading facilities to manage the safety, shutdown and gas depressurization processes.</p> <p>Fire protection and safety measures (operating procedures and emergency response plans) will be used to protect personnel and equipment. Response equipment such as fire and gas detection systems, alarms, fire extinguishers, foam systems, firewater pumps, fire response vehicles, personal protective equipment, monitors, and passive protection will be provided onsite, at appropriate locations.</p>
1162 (2 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	<p><b>(cont'd from above)</b></p> <p>"The fire burned for eight hours, and that fact does seem unusual. I would have thought it would have burned up more quickly," Fay said. "Maybe there wasn't anyone to shut the equipment down. Maybe all of the workers perished in the blast, and the equipment just kept running, spewing LNG out so it just kept burning and burning. ... FERC's rules just say a company would have a 10-minute leak. That's it. But clearly this one kept leaking for a much longer time period."</p> <p>Fay and others said the report is missing a critical piece of information: Whether the fuel that leaked from the pipe at the plant was LNG or a LPG, such as propane, or some combination of both. LNG and LPG were present in some quantities at the Skikda plant, the report said, though the damage to the facility was so extensive, it may be impossible to know exactly what kind of gas formed the vapour cloud.</p> <p>Few would be surprised if LPG proved to be the culprit -- the vapours are known to be highly volatile, and prone to explode when exposed to flame. Pure LNG -- which is almost 100 % methane -- usually is thought to explode only in confined spaces, such as a building or the hull of a ship, according to scientists.</p> <p>In presentations made in Mobile by the DOE, FERC and ExxonMobil, officials stressed that "LNG does not explode." They also said that if an LNG vapour cloud formed and was somehow ignited, the flame would move through the cloud so slowly that a person simply could walk ahead of it and stay out of danger.</p> <p>While some scientists agree that may be true of "pure" LNG, which would be entirely methane, the scientific literature suggests that much of the LNG shipped to facilities around the country typically is contaminated with some quantity of more explosive "LPG" gases, such as propane.</p> <p>A 1980 Coast Guard study titled "LNG Research at China Lake," states that LNG imported into this country is often far from pure, and it reveals that vapour clouds made from "impure" LNG actually explode as readily as the highly volatile LPG. When natural gas is super-cooled and turned into a liquid, as much as 14 % of the total cargo shipped as LNG may actually be LPG or other hydrocarbon fuels, according to the Coast Guard report. Natural gas contains these other fuels when it is pumped from the ground.</p> <p>LNG containing these so-called "higher hydrocarbons" is known as "hot gas" and has a higher energy content than pure methane. The Coast Guard report reveals that vapour clouds of LNG containing at least 13.6 % of these other fuels can detonate just like pure propane gas. The agency concluded in its report that this deserves "special consideration, as the commercial LNG being imported into the US East Coast has about 14 % higher hydrocarbons."</p> <p>Several scientists said they were unaware of the Coast Guard's report. They also were unaware that LNG arriving in the United States sometimes contained significant quantities of other gases, such as propane, butane and ethane. They agreed that in light of the Skikda incident, statements made by the LNG industry and federal officials regarding the explosive potential of LNG vapour clouds may need to be re-examined.</p> <p>"It's pretty clear that this was not sabotage," Fay said, discounting rumours that terrorists may have tried to damage the facility. "I think there is a strong suspicion that the explosion which occurred could have been an LPG explosion or an LNG explosion. If it were LNG, this would be the first major LNG explosion that occurred anywhere." It is also one of the largest vapour cloud explosions on record, according to scientists.</p> <p>"The fact that there was a vapour cloud is huge," said Bill Powers, an engineer based in California who has studied LNG terminals, siting issues for both onshore and offshore proposals. "We don't know if it was an LNG vapour cloud or an LPG cloud or a mix of both, but, either way, it means it is the kind of accident that could happen here."</p> <p><b>(cont'd)</b></p>	

1162 (3 of 3)	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Dodge Cove, British Columbia	(cont'd from above)  Powers pointed out that several terminals proposed for the United States would deal with both LPG and LNG. At the terminal proposed for Long Beach, California, for instance, Powers said the LPG tanks would be right next to the LNG facility. Powers also felt it was noteworthy that Halliburton had conducted a major renovation of the Skikda plant in 1999, updating all of the key safety equipment and computer systems. A Halliburton website touts the revamped LNG terminal as a model of modern American workmanship. "Halliburton is pleased to announce that its recently completed LNG Revamp Project at Skikda, Algeria, has passed all its performance tests," reads the company news release announcing the project's completion. "KBR's work included extensive revamp of the three LNG trains and associated utilities and auxiliaries and a complete revamp of the complex's electrical power and control systems. ... Over 9,000,000 construction man-hours were expended." The three separate LNG regasification plants or "trains" that were revamped by Halliburton were destroyed in the explosion. Powers said Halliburton's engineers had missed a weak link in their safety planning for the facility. "That highlights the importance of putting these facilities in places where, no matter what, people will not be at risk. If a company like Halliburton missed a scenario that could cause this, that tells us that we cannot account for all possible accident scenarios at LNG facilities," Powers said. "Halliburton would have exhaustively checked out every possible accident chain of events and accounted for it, countered it," he said. "They would do that before they give it a clean bill of health. That's how they operate. They must have simply missed this accident possibility."	
1163	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	Dr. David Bowering, retired Chief Medical Health Officer, Northern Health Additional comment March 7th 2017 regarding Aurora Application -The forecast CAC concentration levels showed extreme exceedance of CCME objectives in one forecast (the PRAF F_R) and still show concerning levels in the updated forecast (PRAS F_R_U). -The CAC levels in the Aurora Application are concerning at the forecast presented and any significant correction upwards would push them into an area of greater risk to human health. -The air dispersion model used to estimate CAC concentrations did not include a range of predications based on the likelihood of climate change over the life of the project. Worst case scenarios could be considerably worse than predicted depending on the effects of climate change on weather and wind patterns. -The health risks are both short and long term. Asthma and respiratory irritation in the short term; cardiovascular disease including heart attacks, and chronic respiratory disease including Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the long term. -The residential areas of Prince Rupert, Dodge Cove, Port Edward, Crippen Cove and Metlakatla are at risk. It is my understanding that those areas have a population of about 13,000. -A reasonably accurate forecast of CAC concentrations needs to be done and presented to the public before human health risk is compared to guidelines and assessed; significant errors should be corrected and resubmitted to the public for review.	Please see the "Response to Comments on the Aurora LNG Environmental Assessment Certificate Application from Dr. Barb Faggetter and Dr. David Bowering" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO.
1164	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Prince Rupert, British Columbia	See attached document (public_comment_1164)	Please see the "Response to Comments on the Aurora LNG Environmental Assessment Certificate Application from Dr. Barb Faggetter and Dr. David Bowering" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO.
1165	2017-03-09	SkeenaWild Conservation Trust - Terrace, British Columbia	see attached document (SkeenaWild)	Please see the technical memo "SkeenaWild Conservation Trust" which will be filed with the BC EAO.
1166	2017-03-09	Luanne Roth (T.Buck)	See attached document (public_comment_1166)	Please see the "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO. The "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to the Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo was presented to the Working Group in draft for pre-read on April 17, 2017 under the title of "Air Quality Figures, Datasets and a Comparison to PRAS."
1167	2017-03-09	Personal Information Withheld - Victoria, British Columbia	Re: The Aurora LNG Project Evaluation Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to speak out AGAINST this project: 1. The end product, natural gas, when burned will contribute significantly to global warming. 2. The manufacture of L.N.G. uses up, by burning, a lot of L.N.G. contributing to global warming. 3. L.N.G. carriers are large ships which will interfere with the whale migration routes along our Pacific coast through collisions, and noise pollution. 4. The population of harbour dolphins in the Skeena Estuary will be adversely affected by the L.N.G. carriers, and the construction of the plant, and the plant when operating. 5. Digby Island, where the plant is to be located, and its surrounding eel grass beds are a vital staging area for young salmon on their seaward migration, and should not be disturbed. 6. Digby Island where the plant could be built is a valuable wetland critical for the north south migration of wild birds. 7. The population of the village of Dodge Cove are against the project as it will destroy their present way of life. For all the above reasons, the E.A.O. should recommend against this project. I would be grateful if the recipient of this letter could be acknowledged by email or regular mail. Respectfully submitted,	Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.
1168	2017-03-09	Trinity Consultants Experience - Kent, Washington	See attached document (Trinity)	Please see the "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo which will be filed with the BC EAO. The "Air Quality Model Assumptions, Datasets and a Comparison to the Prince Rupert Airshed Study" technical memo was presented to the Working Group in draft for pre-read on April 17, 2017 under the title of "Air Quality Figures, Datasets and a Comparison to PRAS."