



# **APPENDIX J**

## **Application Review – Public Issue Tracking**

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1	1 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is a place of rare beauty. People from all over the world come to feast in it's sights, especially on their way to Whistler, voted the best ski mountain in the world 5 years running.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2	1 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is a place of rare beauty. People from all over the world come to feast in it's sights, especially on their way to Whistler, voted the best ski mountain in the world 5 years running.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3	1 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Surely gravel can come from elsewhere.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
4	1 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Long ago the area of Stanley Park became a protected park space inspite of it's potential for development and the city and province is forever grateful now for that wonderful decision.</p> <p>Please look to the future. Make Howe Sound a protected place where millions of people can enjoy and learn from this beautiful place.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
5	2 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	With sports fishing cancelled on the salmon this year, it would be irresponsible to allow this project to move forward. I call on DFO to STOP this destructive project before we loose everything. <a href="http://vancouversun.com/business/local-business/dfo-shutting-down-all-salmon-sports-fishing-on-lower-fraser-to-protect-sockeye">http://vancouversun.com/business/local-business/dfo-shutting-down-all-salmon-sports-fishing-on-lower-fraser-to-protect-sockeye</a>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
6	3 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	I wonder how it is that Burnco gets years to figure out its strategy and the public only gets a couple of weeks to review all of the information and critique it in a meaningful way? This is a skewed process in favour of the proponents. The only way to fix this is to postpone the EA process and allow the public a fair review.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
7	4 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	It is difficult to justify the need for this proposed mine. There are already other existing gravel mines in the area that service the Vancouver area.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
8	4 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Please independently look into whether or not this aggregate is truly needed as the benefit does not validate the destruction of a salmon-bearing estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
9	4 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	12 jobs is not worth it to disrupt a wildlife area (elk, grizzly, wolves, and plenty of at-risk species).	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
10	4 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	12 jobs is not worth it to disrupt a wildlife area (elk, grizzly, wolves, and plenty of at-risk species).	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
11	5 - 1	Annie	Sechelt, BC	<p>After experiencing firsthand how municipal, provincial and federal government ignore requests by the public to monitor contravention of the permit by the Lehigh sand and gravel pit mine in Sechelt, the Burnco application is another affront to the sensibilities of those who enjoy BC's landscape. History has shown that once a mine permit is issued, the responsible ministerial department does little to monitor the site.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
12	5 - 2	Annie	Sechelt, BC	<p>The area under application by Burnco is pristine wilderness that stands to be permanently marred by the development of an aggregate mine. The presence of industry in such a remote place would threaten both wildlife and tourism, especially those who seek the silence of nature.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
13	5 - 3	Annie	Sechelt, BC	The area under application by Burnco is pristine wilderness that stands to be permanently marred by the development of an aggregate mine. The presence of industry in such a remote place would threaten both wildlife and tourism, especially those who seek the silence of nature.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
14	5 - 4	Annie	Sechelt, BC	If Lehigh Heidelberg has not set the precedent of a good neighbour to the citizens of Sechelt, is there reason to believe that Burnco would be any different? Any potentially huge taxes paid by Burnco do not justify ignoring the public's interests.	Yes, Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.  Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.
15	5 - 5	Annie	Sechelt, BC	We want the SCR D to listen more closely this time: those of us who call the Sunshine Coast home don't want more scarred landscapes in the name of "development," more noise and dust pollution, and more destruction of beautiful wilderness, especially by multi-million dollar corporations. Whose country is this really?	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR D noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
16	5 - 6	Annie	Sechelt, BC	We want the SCR D to listen more closely this time: those of us who call the Sunshine Coast home don't want more scarred landscapes in the name of "development," more noise and dust pollution, and more destruction of beautiful wilderness, especially by multi-million dollar corporations. Whose country is this really?	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
17	6 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Abbotsford, BC	As a resident of Whistler from 84'-98' in saddened by the continued loss of wildlife habitat. Soon Wolves will be on the I stiff list if we don't protect them for future generations. Please no gravel pit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
18	7 - 1	Chris Laundry	Squamish, BC	<p>Dear Minister</p> <p>Yet again I find myself engaging in the EA process in an effort to protect Howe Sound.</p> <p>My reason for writing is economic. We are generating vast investments in property and tourism as a direct result of people's appreciation of the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
19	7 - 2	Chris Laundry	Squamish, BC	<p>Dear Minister</p> <p>Yet again I find myself engaging in the EA process in an effort to protect Howe Sound.</p> <p>My reason for writing is economic. We are generating vast investments in property and tourism as a direct result of people's appreciation of the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
20	7 - 3	Chris Laundry	Squamish, BC	The disruption to sensitive flora and fauna as a result of this gravel pit being approved is completely unacceptable.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
21	7 - 4	Chris Laundry	Squamish, BC	We have other locations in the province from which to extract aggregate or this nature of need be.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
22	7 - 5	Chris Laundry	Squamish, BC	<p>Allowing this gravel pit in the proposed location is clearly a net negative for our entire region and its economy. There is very little economic upside and only a very tiny number of people will benefit. Please consider the massive adverse effect projects like this have on our local economy. Thank you.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
23	8 - 1	Clara George	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is one of the most important and beautiful places in Canada.</p> <p>It contains a number of estuaries that are important natural places as they provide goods and services that are economically and ecologically indispensable.</p> <p>At a time when climate change threatens our immediate future; the remarkable recovery of the Howe Sound region is vital for scientific study.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands have a huge role to play in carbon sequestration and storage - yet environmental assessments have to yet to value this as industrialization is still on the table.</p> <p>It's up to THIS government to defend our valuable eco-systems to ensure that they, and the rest of our country, remain intact for future generations.</p> <p>It's time that Canada took on a leadership role to fight Climate Change and protect our world.</p> <p>Save Howe Sounds, again.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
24	8 - 2	Clara George	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is one of the most important and beautiful places in Canada.</p> <p>It contains a number of estuaries that are important natural places as they provide goods and services that are economically and ecologically indispensable.</p> <p>At a time when climate change threatens our immediate future; the remarkable recovery of the Howe Sound region is vital for scientific study.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands have a huge role to play in carbon sequestration and storage - yet environmental assessments have to yet to value this as industrialization is still on the table.</p> <p>It's up to THIS government to defend our valuable eco-systems to ensure that they, and the rest of our country, remain intact for future generations.</p> <p>It's time that Canada took on a leadership role to fight Climate Change and protect our world.</p> <p>Save Howe Sounds, again.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
25	8 - 3	Clara George	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is one of the most important and beautiful places in Canada.</p> <p>It contains a number of estuaries that are important natural places as they provide goods and services that are economically and ecologically indispensable.</p> <p>At a time when climate change threatens our immediate future; the remarkable recovery of the Howe Sound region is vital for scientific study.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands have a huge role to play in carbon sequestration and storage - yet environmental assessments have to yet to value this as industrialization is still on the table.</p> <p>It's up to THIS government to defend our valuable eco-systems to ensure that they, and the rest of our country, remain intact for future generations.</p> <p>It's time that Canada took on a leadership role to fight Climate Change and protect our world.</p> <p>Save Howe Sounds, again.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
26	9 - 1	Shira Moir-Smith	Langley, BC	<p>Please leave this area alone! We need wild spaces to survive as well, psychologically, we need to know they're there, that animals roam freely, and the world is not all about profit and greed and destruction.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
27	10 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	<p>I was unable to read BurnCo's Application for Environmental Assessment because the URL could not be found so I am not able to comment on that directly. I can say however that it is my understanding that this project will mine over one million tons of sand and gravel from an ecologically sensitive area that includes McNab Creek, a Pacific salmon spawning area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
28	10 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	<p>It is also an area that has only recently begun to recover from being a critically endangered ecosystem, and only in recent years has marine life such as whales, dolphins, salmon, herring, crabs, and prawns returned to the inlet.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
29	10 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	<p>It is also under threat from a number of industrial and developmental projects including not only the Burnco Aggregate Mine, but also the Woodfibre LNG project, an industrial waste treatment plant proposal, a ski resort, and housing developments for an additional 10,000 people. This is amidst a lack of a single comprehensive management plan for Howe Sound. This is a problem and the barrage of project proposals that seem to largely go unchallenged is indicative of a system that does not properly assess the environmental impact of these projects singularly or in conjunction with one another.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
30	10 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	There is also the question of what right private companies have to exploit a wilderness area for profit. The promise of jobs does not outweigh the almost certain destruction of many aspects of this still recovering ecosystem.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
31	10 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	There is also the question of what right private companies have to exploit a wilderness area for profit. The promise of jobs does not outweigh the almost certain destruction of many aspects of this still recovering ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
32	10 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	There is also the question of what right private companies have to exploit a wilderness area for profit. The promise of jobs does not outweigh the almost certain destruction of many aspects of this still recovering ecosystem.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
33	10 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	We are talking about building a gravel pit on a landscape endowed with some of the most stunning natural scenery in the world, albeit one that still carries scars from an industrially exploitative past.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
34	10 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	Creating a provincial recreation area in lieu of industrial development would not only preserve the land, it would draw visitors from around the globe as well as provide a place for people in nearby Metro Vancouver to visit and experience nature. This surely would create jobs and a thriving local economy.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
35	10 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	<p>Yet there is no profit in that suggestion and that alone should be reason enough to disagree with this proposal. Is there any mention in the environmental assessment of the fact that Burnco donates money to the B.C. Liberals?</p> <p>The last of British Columbia's natural habitats are under siege. With controversies surrounding such topics as the grizzly bear trophy hunt and the government running down packs of wolves to shoot them from helicopters, there is truly a need for more oversight into projects that threaten some of the last remaining ecosystems that have managed to breathe amidst aggressive, for-profit development.</p> <p>Should a private company be able to go into somewhere like Howe Sound and turn it into a gravel pit? Who truly benefits from this? I think we all know the answer to that.</p> <p>You might use the argument that I live in Alberta and so this doesn't affect me. Well, Burnco originates in Alberta so why should I have less say about this than they do?</p> <p>As someone who visits B.C. regularly I can see clearly that its most precious resources lie in its amazing landscapes and abundant wildlife. We don't need to wait until it's too late to protect the things that are worth far more than money, and that will undoubtedly define our legacy for future generations.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
36	11 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Abbotsford, BC	<p>Concern for the wildlife and environment. Especially the wolf population.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Wolves were not specifically identified as candidate or selected valued component for the purpose of the EA. Potential effects on Grizzly Bear are a reasonable surrogate representing mobile and wide ranging mammals such as wolverine, black bear and wolf.</p>
37	12 - 1	Ingrid Wray	Lions Bay, BC	<p>I am opposed to this project for many reasons including the following:</p> <p>Foremost, is the proposed reintroduction of industry into Howe Sound on an random basis with no overall management plan for this precious corridor of BC.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
38	12 - 2	Ingrid Wray	Lions Bay, BC	There has been a slow recovery of the Sound from years of unchecked pollution from Woodfibre, Port Mellon and Britannia mines which resulted in closing the prawn and crab fishing for many years. Herring disappeared and salmon stopped returning to the streams. Hundreds of millions of tax payers dollars later and finally enforcement of laws regulating the companies, the area is now showing signs of recovery.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
39	12 - 3	Ingrid Wray	Lions Bay, BC	If sea life are once again to be under threat, and we are talking of a gravel mine in an estuary who knows if they can ever recover. The Cohen report on the state of the wild salmon stocks and the decline of returning salmon in the Fraser river is a red flag that all our salmon needs to be protected.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
40	12 - 4	Ingrid Wray	Lions Bay, BC	I think there should be a moratorium on any new industries until the cumulative effects can be ascertained. Have we learned nothing from the past mistakes ? Even with mitigation strategies in place the enforcement often comes too little too late , Mount Polley comes to mind.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
41	12 - 5	Ingrid Wray	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound and a river estuary is the wrong place for a gravel mine and the risk of adversely affecting the wildlife habitat too great.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
42	13 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	absolutely oppose this in such a gorgeous part of the world. Find another location that will not adversely affect the way of life for people and ocean life	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
43	14 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Pictures/photos on the Burnco website and on their advertising are deceiving the public. Please check that all the pictures used in their promotions are accurate depictions of what destruction can be expected from this mine - not just the "happy, glossy images" they use to sell this project. They have green-washed everything, including the language they use to describe their project. This sort of manipulation is inappropriate to convince the public to destroy an estuary (by the way, why don't they use this word?).	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
44	14 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	They state that "The Project has been designed based on areas that have been previously cleared, and on detailed groundwater, fisheries and surface water modelling." This is again misleading, as the estuary has a couple of decades to resume its natural state. As well, we drove by in our boat a few years ago and took pictures of them digging up the foreshore - they blamed the loggers but it was to access their property. They are ruthless and don't seem concerned about the public's disinterest in seeing this project move ahead (see all the previous outpouring of negative public comments).	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
45	15 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Once the buyers of gravel in Vancouver understand that the purchase of Burnco gravel is a contribution to the devastation of McNab Creek estuary, they will not buy it. Burnco will be boycotted. And all of this will be a big waste.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
46	16 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Burnco's proposal does not adequately address the concerns raised about elk, grizzly bear, wolves, and other endangered species that will be adversely affected by this mine. They are saying the negative impact is "not significant". That is ridiculous, as anyone with a basic understanding of wildlife will know that the impact will be hugely significant. More independent studies need to be conducted. Also, just adding another waterway is not the same as the one that is intact and has been for several years.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
47	16 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	You can't snap your fingers and create an old-growth forest, can you? The same applies to the estuary that functions in it's own way.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
48	16 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Don't mess with it!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
49	17 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>What will happen to the other gravel suppliers in Vancouver? Why do we need a competitor gravel pit?</p> <p>This project is unnecessary - if we need more gravel, expand the ones that are already in existence.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
50	18 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>How will the anchovy be adversely affected?</p> <p><a href="http://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound">http://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound</a></p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
51	19 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>How can Burnco say there will be no adverse effects on public health and noise? They claim in their proposal that these effects are insignificant. How did they study the adverse psychological impacts of a mine? What references did they use and was their research balanced (meaning they looked at the negative findings) on all the issues because to make grand claims to dismiss the public concerns is not legitimate research.</p>	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments. Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS. A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS. All references are presented in Volume 4, Part G - Section 21 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
52	20 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>How will the proposed mine affect the domino effect of the the mass sea star die-off and the killing of other species?</p> <p><a href="http://www.ctvnews.ca/sci-tech/mass-die-off-of-sea-stars-in-b-c-s-howe-sound-reveals-ecological-shift-1.2957048">http://www.ctvnews.ca/sci-tech/mass-die-off-of-sea-stars-in-b-c-s-howe-sound-reveals-ecological-shift-1.2957048</a></p>	<p>Extensive outbreaks of sea star wasting disease have been documented on the west coast of North America, leading to mass mortalities of a number of species of sea star. The mining and shipping of aggregate will not affect the nature or extent of these types of outbreaks.</p>
53	21 - 1	Dave Gauley	Squamish, BC	<p>Howe sound is just recovering from decades of industry.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
54	21 - 2	Dave Gauley	Squamish, BC	It is a beautiful place, and the mouth of mc nab creek is a place boaters enjoy for its calm waters. I oppose the mine project as short sighted when weighed against the impacts it will have on the sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
55	21 - 3	Dave Gauley	Squamish, BC	It is a beautiful place, and the mouth of mc nab creek is a place boaters enjoy for its calm waters. I oppose the mine project as short sighted when weighed against the impacts it will have on the sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
56	21 - 4	Dave Gauley	Squamish, BC	I oppose the mine project as short sighted when weighed against the impacts it will have on the sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
57	22 - 1	David Crowther	Squamish, BC	I am against this gravel pit operation because it will damage Howe Sound's water quality with silt and suspended fine particles in the water.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
58	23 - 1	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	A gravel mine? I thought we were done with this nonsense. A pod of killer whales just passed, perhaps 20-25. Looking for salmon and anchovies.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
59	23 - 2	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	A gravel mine will prove to be destructive to the Howe Sound environment.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
60	23 - 3	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Short comment registering my opposition.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
61	24 - 1	Richard Zimmer	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	I recently purchased property on Gambier Island to show my family the beauty of the ocean and mountains. We look directly at the proposed burnco gravel pit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
62	24 - 2	Richard Zimmer	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	Howe sound has just recently recovered from years of pollution.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
63	24 - 3	Richard Zimmer	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	I can't believe that the BC government would risk this beautiful area for a few dollars of tax revenue. I would rather you raise my taxes.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
64	24 - 4	Richard Zimmer	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	The mine will disrupt the enjoyment of all owners in the area as well as tourism which I see constantly on the sound. Please deny their application.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
65	25 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Has advertising Canada reviewed the claims made by Burnco? Truth matters.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
66	26 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>What would it take to make LIFE SO UNBEARABLE THAT you move from YOUR HOME??</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to lose all your friends?</li> <li>- to lose your sense of community?</li> <li>- to be displaced after 20 years?</li> <li>- to lose your property value?</li> <li>- to compromise your and your family's health and well-being?</li> </ul> <p>What would it take to have YOU move from YOUR home?</p> <p>This is an ethical conundrum one would hope that the proponents would consider the ethics of displacing families and communities for profit.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
67	27 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Would like to see Burnco use clear language in their documents - not tentative wording. I.e. "not likely" to operate noise, lighting 24/7 is not reassuring at all. The sort of tentative wording leaves room to operate at full capacity despite the complaints from those who reside in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
68	27 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Would like to see Burnco use clear language in their documents - not tentative wording. I.e. "not likely" to operate noise, lighting 24/7 is not reassuring at all. The sort of tentative wording leaves room to operate at full capacity despite the complaints from those who reside in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
69	28 - 1	Denise Olson	Gibsons, BC	<p>I am definitively AGAINST the Burnco Aggregate proposal for Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
70	28 - 2	Denise Olson	Gibsons, BC	It will set the entire Howe sound region (impacted by silt, ship traffic etc) decades back in beginning to be a healthy ecosystem.. We are just now seeing recovery from decades of environmental abuse by industry which left years ago.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
71	28 - 3	Denise Olson	Gibsons, BC	With salmon runs decreasing all over the province , it is incumbent Apon us all to recognize and acknowledge that this area is essential to preservation and cannot be compromised by this for profit business .	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
72	29 - 1	David Okell	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound is more valuable as a recreational area, and home to an increasing population on the sea to sky corridor.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
73	29 - 2	David Okell	Bowen Island, BC	This proposed development will degrade the environment	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
74	29 - 3	David Okell	Bowen Island, BC	This proposed development will be visible from the famed seatosky hwy	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
75	29 - 4	David Okell	Bowen Island, BC	This proposed development will devalue properties on Gambier and on the sea to sky corridor .	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
76	29 - 5	David Okell	Bowen Island, BC	Gravel is obtainable elsewhere, to destroy this pristine environment is nothing less than the continuing rape of our environment by greedy corporations who are only concerned with profit to the detriment of Howe Sound. Shame on you for even considering this proposal	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
77	30 - 1	Tracey Dudley	North Vancouver, BC	this is my disapproval for the Mcnab Creek gravel mine!	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
78	30 - 2	Tracey Dudley	North Vancouver, BC	This will have an extreme impact on our wildlife!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
79	31 - 1	Denise McCracken	Furry Creek, BC	<p>Our Province must decide whether Howe Sound and its proximity to Whistler and Metro Vancouver should be protected as a corridor to the wilderness and a showcase for our commitment to Environmental protection or the antithesis of this by allowing Industry to recontaminate and destroy the fragile beauty the Sound Provides.</p> <p>Once industry becomes established it only grows and more industry evades by precedent. Surely this corridor needs our protection !</p> <p>Please think and protect this unique gift of Nature!</p> <p>No industry in Howe Sound it is the perfect tourist corridor and deserves to be protected !</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
80	32 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I oppose a large scale gravel mine near the Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
81	32 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	We need to preserve our ecosystem and not subject it to the devastating effects of a gravel mine.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
82	33 - 1	Jason Del Vicario	Bowyer Island, BC	I'm outraged we are considering re-destroying parts of Howe Sound in the name of economic development. Howe Sound is North America's southern most fjord and on the doorstep of Vancouver and Sea to Sky country which relies heavily on tourism for economic activity.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
83	33 - 2	Jason Del Vicario	Bowyer Island, BC	Howe Sound is only JUST now seeing the return of herring and anchovy runs and as a result salmon and orcas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
84	33 - 3	Jason Del Vicario	Bowyer Island, BC	The Britannia Mine and pulp mill at Port Melon basically killed the sound for 5 decades.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
85	33 - 4	Jason Del Vicario	Bowyer Island, BC	And for what?... Some gravel and 12 FT jobs. It just makes zero sense... Please have some foresight and stop this poor use of our beautiful sound!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
86	34 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Williamsons Landing, BC	Time to save this magnificent fjord, now that wildlife is finally returning, after many years of displacement/disappearance caused by earlier disturbance/pollution.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
87	34 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Williamsons Landing, BC	Recent exciting sightings of orcas, dolphins, and increases of sealife.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
88	34 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Williamsons Landing, BC	We owe it to nature and Canada. How can you possibly ruin it again - perhaps forever?!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
89	35 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	I am writing as a resident of Keats Island in Howe Sound, in close proximity to the proposed project area. This is an environmentally healthy area with biodiversity and marine life specific to the area that would be damaged by the Bunco site. The wildlife in this particular area would be subject to so much change that would in turn, impact the entire chain from micro to macro, meaning from the smallest organisms such as algae through the entire chain and up to the largest predators, whales that use this ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
90	35 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	In addition, there is so much beauty and enjoyment to be had in this area by kayakers, swimmers and nature lovers that the increase in boat traffic and commercial transport for this facility would drastically reduce the quality of life in Howe Sound. I don't believe that the stakeholders in this region are in favour of such a project in this location.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
91	35 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	I am of the strong opinion that this project is not in the best interest of anyone nor in the best interest of wildlife and biodiversity in a critically acclaimed part of BC - this is a project that is solely for the benefit of the company and does not provide any meaningful jobs or long term sustainability to the area. Please do not let this project proceed.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
92	36 - 1	Gord Broughton	Mill Bay, BC	Please don't allow this to happen, Howe Sound should be made into a marine park, for us and for future generations.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
93	36 - 2	Gord Broughton	Mill Bay, BC	As a past 12 year resident of Lions Bay, I feel this would be a travesty to see Howe Sound become an industrial zone again, especially after it has healed so well from us humans last mining made such a toxic mess.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
94	37 - 1	Richard G. Rawlins	Bowen Island, BC	I would like to go on record as being opposed to further expansion of the Burnco gravel mine in Squamish.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
95	37 - 2	Richard G. Rawlins	Bowen Island, BC	There is little evidence that the encroachment into Howe Sound will have any community benefit other than a few jobs. The revenue stream will not aid the community either.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
96	37 - 3	Richard G. Rawlins	Bowen Island, BC	On the contrary, the proposed expansion will only further denigrate the pristine Howe Sound and Squamish area, which would be much more profitable to develop for tourism which would benefit everyone in the area and generate funds to protect and maintain this exception land.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
97	37 - 4	Richard G. Rawlins	Bowen Island, BC	Squamish history as an industrial site for paper, mining, and proposed LNG tank farm, and now huge gravel pit, should be left in the past and the community should move forward into utilization and management of sustainable resources that reinforce what is so special about Sea to Sky.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
98	38 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Why would anyone want to wreck the most scenic and beautiful place on Earth? You pay paradise when you put up a parking lot. You don't know what you've got til it's gone.... Burno, make it an ecological park and you will make money in spades and become the admiration of the world!	A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.  The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.  Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.
99	39 - 1	Judy Osburn	Pasley Island, BC	Howe Sound is a national treasure and should be protected from industry.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
100	39 - 2	Judy Osburn	Pasley Island, BC	I have lived in the Collingwood Channel area for over 60 years and have experienced the amazing change over the past 5 years with the return of sea life due to the closure of Britannia Mines and Port Mellon Paper. As we move forward the value of pristine waters will be of far more economic value than polluted dead waters.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
101	39 - 3	Judy Osburn	Pasley Island, BC	Howe Sound is a national treasure and should be protected from industry. I have lived in the Collingwood Channel area for over 60 years and have experienced the amazing change over the past 5 years with the return of sea life due to the closure of Britannia Mines and Port Mellon Paper. As we move forward the value of pristine waters will be of far more economic value than polluted dead waters.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
102	40 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	An environmentally destructive gravel pit that provides only around 12 jobs in one of the most spectacular fiords in the world on the doorstep of a world class city ? No! No! No!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
103	41 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Do not go ahead with this project. There is no plan for Howe Sound. Each proposed project is looked at in terms of taxes to BC and not in terms of liveable region, ANY consideration of the environment and wildlife, or any better options.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
104	41 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	There's also no explanation of why we need this. I understand aggregate is used for building AND how can we get this without messing with our fish, our waters, creating boat traffic where none was, ruining the environmental recovery that has started to happen. What problem are "We" trying to solve by allowing the Burnco project to go ahead? The short sighted approach with lack of cohesive and integrated thought or planning is unacceptable.	The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.  Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
105	42 - 1	Eileen Mackenzie	Bowyer Island, BC	this is too much destruction for too few jobs and shows a reckless lack of concern for our environment	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
106	43 - 1	Brigitta Shore	Lions Bay, BC	This is such a terrible project, I can't believe you can consider it. McNab is one of three estuaries in Howe Sound, it births life and there is no one who believes that having an aggregate mine will not destroy this. We have already seen industrial destruction in Howe Sound, it took years and millions of tax dollars and volunteer groups to clean up and rebuild the health of the ocean.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
107	43 - 2	Brigitta Shore	Lions Bay, BC	Tourism is flourishing in Howe Sound, it's on the Sea to Sky Corridor, the aorta to whistler, people come by boat, car, plane and ferry to swim, paddle, hike, camp and enjoy cabin and boating life in natural splendour with beautiful wild life in the ocean and on land.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
108	43 - 3	Brigitta Shore	Lions Bay, BC	It's as valuable if not more so than Stanley Park, have the foresight and respect to protect this area from industry. BC residents will loose in the short term by not being able to enjoy the area or the ocean life that will be destroyed, our tourism will be hit, and in the long term the cleanup and destruction will again cost us more than you make in tax revenue and 12 local jobs. Don't do it please, the down side far outweighs the upside! Attached is a picture of a bear at McNab dining on mussels for breakfast, 100 ft from our boat.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
109	44 - 1	Elise Roberts	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is a water that is in recovery with herring finally returning after a decade of absence.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
110	44 - 2	Elise Roberts	North Vancouver, BC	I do not support any industrial activity in this area, especially in a watershed zone. And for only 12 jobs it is not worth it. Please do not put private profit over the wishes of the many citizens and tourists who love these areas, one of the most spectacular area and naturally rich ecosystems in Canada.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
111	45 - 1	Doreen Gregson	Lions Bay, BC	I am AGAINST the proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek!!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
112	45 - 2	Doreen Gregson	Lions Bay, BC	The recovery of Howe Sound and the ongoing use and enjoyment of this valuable resource, by all, should trump the application for a profit-making venture that will damage the local environment and eco-system!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
113	46 - 1	Peter Ryan	Vancouver, BC	Enough development of our recovering natural development in the Howe Sound! In an age when progressive economies are becoming eco friendly BC is the opposite with greed in government steamrolling purely economic agendas.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
114	46 - 2	Peter Ryan	Vancouver, BC	People in BC love their environment and are among healthiest on the planet.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
115	46 - 3	Peter Ryan	Vancouver, BC	This project for a measly dozen jobs along with its impact on the now rebounding Howe Sound is not needed, it is an affront to all the hard work and sound effort which is restoring this vital waterway so close to our major population center!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
116	46 - 4	Peter Ryan	Vancouver, BC	Stop this greed and insanity and keep the industrial blight and ugliness away from Vancouver which even now pushes the envelope what with heavy and increasing shipping through its ports! Enough is enough.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
117	47 - 1	Lisa	Seattle, USA	I will not support a government that approves the Burnco mine in Squamish.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
118	48 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Galiano, BC	I support the Burnco Aggregate Project because we need jobs and real economic activity to support the people of B.C. and Canada. The environmental risk is very low and manageable compared to the great economic benefits this project will produce.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
119	49 - 1	Lisa Falconer	Vancouver, BC	Over the past 3 years we have personally seen the growing improvement and return of marine life in Howe Sound. We have enjoyed many dolphin sightings, and have seen Orcas cruising past McNabb Creek during the last 3 summers. As recreational boaters in Howe Sound, we harvest prawns and crabs just off the point of the proposed Burnco gravel operation.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
120	49 - 2	Lisa Falconer	Vancouver, BC	Careful stewardship of this remarkable area has kept prawn, crab and fish stocks healthy in Howe Sound--restriction of industry and one can assume, the health of the water has brought back whales and dolphins. Slowly but surely--it has been improved. And now we are proposing to throw all that away?  I feel that we have been given a second chance to preserve the health and beauty of Howe Sound. I think it would be criminal to endanger it with increased industrial facilities such as the Burnco project.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
121	49 - 3	Lisa Falconer	Vancouver, BC	The noise will impinge on the ability of recreational visitors to enjoy being in proximity to the operation. Barges and hi-speed water taxi traffic will scare away the orcas and dolphins. In addition, the wake produced by these vessels damage established docks across from McNabb and erode shoreline.  The area near McNabb creek is also one of the last safe anchorages for boaters in Howe Sound, and the Burnco operation will block access to the land.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
122	49 - 4	Lisa Falconer	Vancouver, BC	Allowing this kind of destructive and disruption operation does not respect the investments made by various stakeholder groups in the Howe Sound area--effectively destroying the value of their landholdings and recreational organizations. An example of that is the Thunderbird Yacht Club which purchased their land--directly across from McNabb Creek and the Burrard Yacht Club as well. These two groups bought their land many years ago and have been conscientious occupants, respectful of the land and marine resources they enjoy. Is there no protection for quiet enjoyment of property? We are members of TBYC and I can tell you that we agonize about cutting down a single tree. The Burnco proposal makes our care to preserve the natural beauty of our area seem like a joke.	Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).  BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
123	49 - 5	Lisa Falconer	Vancouver, BC	I haven't addressed the claims of creating jobs as those claims (12 jobs?) just don't "hold water" compared to the preservation of an amazing recreational gem that is so close to the city.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
124	50 - 1	Robert Thompson	North Vancouver, BC	I'm not against pipelines, LNG, logging or most recourse extraction that creates wealth for our province. I'm not even against gravel extraction. This one, however, is proposed for what is the only pristine valley along steep Howe Sound. This is an area of recreational escape from the big city. This is not the right place for the destruction, dust, noise and lights produced extracting gravel. Surely there are more suitable locations farther away from vacation homes, water skiing, boating, hunting, fishing and the such. We have an entire province to extract resources. Doing it in the city's playground simply does not serve today's or future citizens very well.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
125	51 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>A large scale gravel mine continues to press forward at McNab Creek, smack in the middle of the Sound.</p> <p>This is the worst idea ever. Why would this be approved despite the risks and low job creation. Not worthy of the destruction of the land and risk to estuaries. Please consider the harm to the environment and do not allow this application to proceed.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
126	52 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>More studies and consideration needs to be done of the cumulative effects of all the industries - the run of river project alone is overload for this area.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
127	53 - 1	Jack Johnston	Kelowna, BC	<p>The approval process for this type of project takes ridiculously long. Imagine trying to build the Trans Canada Highway or the transcontinental railroad now. Impossible, it would never get done!</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
128	54 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What impact will the mine have the comeback of anchovy in the area? What research has Burnco performed on this aspect of their operation and the negative effects of the mine on anchovy?</p> <p><a href="http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound">http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound</a></p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
129	55 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	No social license!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
130	56 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Fine particles from gravel extraction cause cancer. Wind in the sound is constant and will be blown all over the place. For the health of everyone, please do not allow this mine to move forward. There has been much research done that tells us that dust from gravel operations can cause health problems. People that have existing lung conditions or other health problems can be impacted largely by dust but overall long-term exposure for anyone is not good.	A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
131	56 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	And Burnco will operate every day for 16+ years.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
132	56 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	There effects will be great from having a permanent operation in the vicinity. Dust is made up of tiny, solid particles (particulate matter) floating in the air. Dust that is generated and released into the air as a direct result of human activity is known as “fugitive” particulate emissions, meaning that it has escaped from its place of origin. Dust blowing from gravel pits, mines or construction sites are all indications that a fugitive dust issue may exist.	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
133	56 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>People should be concerned about this dust because of the problems it can create including death.</p> <p>Exposure to particles can lead to a variety of serious health effects. Coarse particles (such as those found stirred up in the wind blown dust) and fine particles (such as those found in haze) pose the greatest problems because they can get deep into the lungs. Scientific studies have linked particle pollution exposure to a variety of health problems including: decreased lung function, development of chronic bronchitis, increased respiratory symptoms, heartbeat irregularities and heart attacks, just to name a few.</p> <p>Residents living in the vicinity of a gravel pit or similar operation are at greatest risk for this type of exposure, not to mention all other living creatures that have had absolutely no say in the acts of civilization. In medical literature, the term for this type of disease is called silicosis and it needs to be dealt with on an individual constitutional level. The main thing to consider is the health of everyone and everything in the sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
134	57 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The killer is the fine particles of dust you cannot see. The mining and crushing of gravel creates and releases fine particulate matter called Crystalline Silica into the air which will be carried by the wind towards homes and schools.</p> <p>These dangerous particles will cover the ocean, permeate homes, neighborhood parks, schools, and playgrounds.</p> <p>Adults and vulnerable children and seniors will be exposed to this harmful carcinogen every day, all day.</p> <p>Why the EA would CHOOSE to allow the creation of a toxic environment for our neighborhoods and these neighborhood schools when they do, in fact, have authority?</p> <p>The EA needs to use their authority to deny the permit in order to protect public health, safety, economic development, and quality of life is inexcusable, incomprehensible, and UNACCEPTABLE.</p> <p>So what's wrong with Crystalline Silica?</p> <p>Crystalline Silica, a known carcinogen (cancer causing agent) which has been found to cause lung cancer, silicosis, and other health hazards!</p> <p>SOME FACTS:</p> <p>Some of the Crystalline Silica can be of the most dangerous variety with a designation as a PM2.5 particle. Those are particles that measure less than 2.5 micro meters in size. Once these tiny particles enter the lung they stay there. The body's natural defense encapsulates them causing permanent lung damage or cancer.</p> <p>Winds can carry these fine particles over great distances.</p> <p>The closer you are to the source, the higher the concentration and danger. Health effects can range from Silicosis, lung cancer,</p>	<p>BURNCO's HSE Management Plan includes a Silica Exposure Code of Practice (SECOP) to identify the potential sources of crystalline silica exposure and to establish suitable control measures to protect workers, contractors and the general public from any related harmful effects on human health. The SECOP outlines controls which will be implemented on-site to control dust generation. The control and suppression of dust are the principal ways in which worker exposure to crystalline silica will be mitigated. Similarly, dust control activities will also be carried out to prevent human health impacts in the environment beyond the boundaries of the operation.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. The SECOP will be incorporated into the Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. Mitigation measures outlined in this Plan will assist in controlling particulate and potential silicate emissions from the Proposed Project (please refer to Section 5.7.5.3 and Table 5.7-11 of the EAC Application/EIS for mitigation measures incorporated in the Air Quality Assessment).</p> <p>Baseline air monitoring will be carried out prior to operation to establish dust and crystalline silica levels. Ongoing monitoring of dust levels and periodic x-ray diffraction analysis of dust samples for silica content will be conducted to confirm the effectiveness of the dust control program and the concentration of silica in dust generated at the site. Modifications will be made to the dust control program, as appropriate, to continuously improve dust suppression and reduce silica exposure levels to as low as reasonably practicable and below the allowable limit (8-hour time weighted average) of 0.025 mg/m3 for crystalline silica as set out in the WorkSafeBC Table of Exposure Limits for Chemical and Biological Substances.</p>
135	58 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>I 100% support this industry on our water. We need the gravel if we continue to want to add development in our communities. Perfectly suited location. Please do not let the "privileged individuals of Bowen and Bower Islands" to speak for us who support industry and jobs. One of the "summer" islanders actually posted that Industry and marine traffic would "spoil their views from their deck." There will be high paying jobs and years of employment. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
136	59 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	<p>As a Burrard Yacht Club member, the club is speaking for the membership without permission. I support this project as does my husband.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
137	60 - 1	Brent O'Malley	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound is just now recovering from decades of industrial abuse through most of the 20th century. Allowing a gravel mining operation will turn back a decade of rebirth that the Sound has been enjoying!	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
138	60 - 2	Brent O'Malley	Bowen Island, BC	Tourism brings more money into the local economy than this project ever will. This project must be stopped.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
139	61 - 1	Mike Collier	Not Stated	I am opposed to this development in such a sensitive environment.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
140	61 - 2	Mike Collier	Not Stated	I cannot see how the fish and wildlife will not be utterly destroyed for generations.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.
141	62 - 1	Dave Matthews	Not Stated	I have reviewed the materials available on the web regarding this project. I do not support this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
142	62 - 2	Dave Matthews	Not Stated	Beyond the numerous negative impacts on the local flora and fauna as outlined in the environmental assessment, placing a gravel pit in the middle of the beauty of Howe sound seems irresponsible and short sighted.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.
143	62 - 3	Dave Matthews	Not Stated	This entire area is an easily accessible recreational mecca for both local and tourists.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
144	62 - 4	Dave Matthews	Not Stated	There are many other less impactful sights to barge gravel from.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
145	63 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<i>Fax attachment included in tab Ref #63</i>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
146	64 - 1	Karen Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	This is the worst possible development proposal and must not proceed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
147	64 - 2	Karen Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	Think of the next 16 years this project will run; during a doubling of the population in Greater Vancouver and surrounding of Howe Sound, with the accompanying demand for the precious magnificent recreational use of the Sound next door.	The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.  Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
148	64 - 3	Karen Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	Think of the next 16 years this project will run; during a doubling of the population in Greater Vancouver and surrounding of Howe Sound, with the accompanying demand for the precious magnificent recreational use of the Sound next door.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
149	64 - 4	Karen Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	Think of the precious sea life, the last pristine valley with its salmon, bears, cougar and elk.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
150	64 - 5	Karen Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	Think, think, think. All for a lousy 12 jobs???	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
151	65 - 1	Robert (Robb) and Bonny Schultz	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Howe Sound is again becoming rich with returning sea life species such as Anchovy, Herring, Chinook Salmon, Bottom fish, Porpoises, Orca, Humpback Whales and Seals.</p> <p>Also bird life including bald eagles, hawks, sea gulls, geese and ducks are feeding on this balance. BC Spotted Prawns and Dungeness Crab are also here now but for how long, will it last if this project proceeds? Stop Howe Sound Re-Industrialization immediately.</p> <p>Wonderful to witness this regeneration over the past 45 years that we have lived here, as full time residents. Howe Sound polluters like Britannia Beach Copper Mine, Woodfibre Pulp Mill, FMC Chemical Plant for Pulp Mills are examples of the industrialization that gradually wiped-out the fish/sea life habitats in this region. Over the past nearly 50 years these waters have slowly been detoxified and cleaned-up. These polluting industries have shut down and there is still a long way to go. We must protect and save our Sound, not mess it up again.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
152	65 - 2	Robert (Robb) and Bonny Schultz	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Do not allow them to re-industrialize Howe Sound! It has much stronger tourism values for the BC and international markets with Whistler Blackcomb being North America's #1 Ski destination and the obvious success of the new Squamish Gondola Project. Tourism is in our short and long term future while Burnco Aggregate Mining operating here is totally unacceptable to me.</p> <p>Just look at it and you'll see. Where is the Sun Derby winning run of huge Tye Salmon that were caught year after year at McNabb Creek in the past? There is no place here for this Aggregate proposal, anywhere near McNabb Creek.</p> <p>Burnco Aggregate Project must not be considered for Howe Sound. What will it do to improve our marine species and Tourism described above? What is its environmental benefit to Howe Sound? What limits, if any, have been placed on the size of this aggregate mining and marine transportation project?</p> <p>Count us permanently opposed to this gravel and sand exploitation project in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
153	66 - 1	Marcus Culver	Whistler, BC	Please don't build a gravel pit in Howe Sound!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
154	67 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>BURNCO Rock Products wants to dig a 74+ acre pit, create an onsite crushing and processing plant, producing 20+ million tonnes of aggregate over 16 + years. The project will create only 12 direct operational jobs and threaten a productive estuary.</p> <p>Have we not learned from the gravel pit horror stories throughout BC &amp; their owner's lack of responsibility for damaging our ecosystems, polluting the environment &amp; riding rough shod over the area citizens request for accountability &amp; stewardship? Why would we even consider such a project?</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
155	67 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>BURNCO Rock Products wants to dig a 74+ acre pit, create an onsite crushing and processing plant, producing 20+ million tonnes of aggregate over 16 + years. The project will create only 12 direct operational jobs and threaten a productive estuary.</p> <p>Have we not learned from the gravel pit horror stories throughout BC &amp; their owner's lack of responsibility for damaging our ecosystems, polluting the environment &amp; riding rough shod over the area citizens request for accountability &amp; stewardship? Why would we even consider such a project?</p>	<p>Yes, Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
156	67 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Sunshine Coast, BC	As for the environmental assessment, I would hope that all the BC gravel pit problems & history will also be seriously examined. Existing legislation has not been changed for years, consequently there is very little accountability for environmental damage.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
157	68 - 1	Gord Broughton	Mill Bay, BC	To destroy the mouth of McNab Creek would be a very foolish thing to do. The fish and wildlife would be gone. An entire ecosystem destroyed.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
158	69 - 1	Brianna	Vancouver Island, BC	I do not agree with this project as I wish to protect the beautiful environment which means a lot to me and many other people. There is no need to destroy a perfect natural area which is priceless and means more than anything ever could.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
159	70 - 1	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound and environs should be developed into a marine preservation sanctuary.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
160	70 - 2	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	The feed stocks have improved and now the killer whales by the dozens are back.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
161	70 - 3	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	What a venue for the tourist industry! What an opportunity for scientific research!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
162	70 - 4	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Gravel pits are not what we should support in Howe Sound. Go somewhere else please.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
163	71 - 1	Christina Halldorson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I came to Howe Sound in 1985. The most beautiful place I'd ever seen. I still live in Howe Sound today and spend a great deal of time boating there. My vision for Howe sound has always been residential development and to eliminate industrial development. Eco- tourism and sharing this wonderful spot with the world has always been my vision for this area. A great deal of funds has been spent on developing a new sea to sky highway which has made the area much safer to access. Wildlife has returned after much funds was spent on the Britannia Mine clean up. Why on gods green earth would anyone with any conscience would so to speak " pave paradise and put up a parking lot " you don't know what you've got till it's gone!</p> <p>The residential population of Howe Sound are the protectors and keepers of the Sound.</p> <p>Governmental authorities should listen to the residents. Burnco can easily get gravel elsewhere. The crushing of gravel in this area is unthinkable.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
164	71 - 2	Christina Halldorson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I came to Howe Sound in 1985. The most beautiful place I'd ever seen. I still live in Howe Sound today and spend a great deal of time boating there. My vision for Howe sound has always been residential development and to eliminate industrial development. Eco- tourism and sharing this wonderful spot with the world has always been my vision for this area. A great deal of funds has been spent on developing a new sea to sky highway which has made the area much safer to access. Wildlife has returned after much funds was spent on the Britannia Mine clean up. Why on gods green earth would anyone with any conscience would so to speak " pave paradise and put up a parking lot " you don't know what you've got till it's gone!</p> <p>The residential population of Howe Sound are the protectors and keepers of the Sound.</p> <p>Governmental authorities should listen to the residents. Burnco can easily get gravel elsewhere. The crushing of gravel in this area is unthinkable.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
165	71 - 3	Christina Halldorson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I came to Howe Sound in 1985. The most beautiful place I'd ever seen. I still live in Howe Sound today and spend a great deal of time boating there. My vision for Howe sound has always been residential development and to eliminate industrial development. Eco- tourism and sharing this wonderful spot with the world has always been my vision for this area. A great deal of funds has been spent on developing a new sea to sky highway which has made the area much safer to access. Wildlife has returned after much funds was spent on the Britannia Mine clean up. Why on gods green earth would anyone with any conscience would so to speak " pave paradise and put up a parking lot " you don't know what you've got till it's gone!</p> <p>The residential population of Howe Sound are the protectors and keepers of the Sound.</p> <p>Governmental authorities should listen to the residents. Burnco can easily get gravel elsewhere. The crushing of gravel in this area is unthinkable.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
166	72 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Ekins Point, BC	I am strongly opposed to the proposed McNab Creek gravel mine. I am a resident of North Vancouver and have been a member of Burrard Yacht Club for more than 10 years and have been enjoying our Ekins Point outstation for that time. This area of Howe Sound has high recreational value and is a wonderful escape from Vancouver within a few hours boat travel. The area is already the subject of industrial development to its detriment. The addition of the noise and visual impact of a gravel mine would degrade the recreational value of the area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
167	72 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Ekins Point, BC	I am strongly opposed to the proposed McNab Creek gravel mine. I am a resident of North Vancouver and have been a member of Burrard Yacht Club for more than 10 years and have been enjoying our Ekins Point outstation for that time. This area of Howe Sound has high recreational value and is a wonderful escape from Vancouver within a few hours boat travel. The area is already the subject of industrial development to its detriment. The addition of the noise and visual impact of a gravel mine would degrade the recreational value of the area.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
168	72 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Ekins Point, BC	I am strongly opposed to the proposed McNab Creek gravel mine. I am a resident of North Vancouver and have been a member of Burrard Yacht Club for more than 10 years and have been enjoying our Ekins Point outstation for that time. This area of Howe Sound has high recreational value and is a wonderful escape from Vancouver within a few hours boat travel. The area is already the subject of industrial development to its detriment. The addition of the noise and visual impact of a gravel mine would degrade the recreational value of the area.	A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.  The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.  Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
169	73 - 1	Jay Snow	West Vancouver, BC	We are just seeing salmon and whales back in the sound . What effect will this mine have on the fish and whale environment ?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
170	74 - 1	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	Our poor Howe Sound finally got cleaned up after years of sledge dumping from the pulp mill and trailings from the copper mine only to be threatened with natural gas transfer and now an aggregate processing plant! It is time for the locals of the area, not out of Province, to have their voices heard. It is time to think about our precious environment for its own sake instead of the sake of the dollar! It is 2016 for golly's sake!	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
171	74 - 2	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	BURNCO Rock Products of Alberta wants to dig a 74+ acre pit, build an onsite crushing and processing plant, and produce 20+ million tonnes of aggregate over 16 + years. The project will create only 12 direct operational jobs and faces widespread community opposition, despite which the company continues to pursue the development.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
172	75 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Do not want another open pit mine in the area Leave the land alone	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
173	76 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What steps are being done to protect the McNab coastal Grizzly Bear?</p> <p>The coastal grizzly bear is a subspecies still found in rural areas of the Sunshine Coast - almost extinct and in need of preservation. Hunters and local residents at McNab have seen grizzlies in the area. What documentation has Burnco done to acknowledge the existence of these bears in the area?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
174	77 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As a local SCUBA diver, biologist, and recreational boater in Howe Sound, I do not approve of this project. Howe Sound has finally started to recover since the clean up of Britannia Mine. Marine and terrestrial life in Howe Sound is at major risk from these plans which would divert three creeks, create lots of noise, as well as waste. I do not endorse this project and I believe it is a terrible idea to move forward with this decision without serious consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada on it's impacts on all wildlife that live in or visit Howe Sound.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
175	77 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As a local SCUBA diver, biologist, and recreational boater in Howe Sound, I do not approve of this project. Howe Sound has finally started to recover since the clean up of Britannia Mine. Marine and terrestrial life in Howe Sound is at major risk from these plans which would divert three creeks, create lots of noise, as well as waste.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
176	77 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I do not endorse this project and I believe it is a terrible idea to move forward with this decision without serious consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada on it's impacts on all wildlife that live in or visit Howe Sound.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
177	77 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	As a person who enjoys Howe Sound for its natural beauty and serene quiet, I also disapprove of putting in a large eyesore that creates lots of noise, and frightens and keeps the marine life and wildlife I go to enjoy away.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
178	77 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	As a person who enjoys Howe Sound for its natural beauty and serene quiet, I also disapprove of putting in a large eyesore that creates lots of noise, and frightens and keeps the marine life and wildlife I go to enjoy away.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
179	77 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	As a person who enjoys Howe Sound for its natural beauty and serene quiet, I also disapprove of putting in a large eyesore that creates lots of noise, and frightens and keeps the marine life and wildlife I go to enjoy away.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
180	77 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	As a person who enjoys Howe Sound for its natural beauty and serene quiet, I also disapprove of putting in a large eyesore that creates lots of noise, and frightens and keeps the marine life and wildlife I go to enjoy away.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
181	77 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There is no benefit to those who are residing near the mine, there are no benefits to those who come to enjoy the area for recreation, and there will be horrible ecological and biological consequences to Howe Sound.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
182	78 - 1	Cynthia Simonis	Delta, BC	I oppose this application. The environment needs attention but not from these types of companies that wish to exploit the land.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
183	79 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	This will devastate Howe Sound and all the animals and water life in the area. It would be bad for tourism and have a long terms impact for generations to come, creating an ecological barren area. No to a gravel pit. BC and Howe Sound deserve better.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
184	79 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	This will devastate Howe Sound and all the animals and water life in the area. It would be bad for tourism and have a long terms impact for generations to come, creating an ecological barren area. No to a gravel pit. BC and Howe Sound deserve better.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
185	80 - 1	Robin Spano	Lions Bay, BC	Concerned about salmon populations. The mine is due to disrupt an important estuary where salmon, and I believe also herring, spawn.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.
186	80 - 2	Robin Spano	Lions Bay, BC	I also oppose the project as a resident of the area who has seen major rejuvenation of marine wildlife in recent years. Gravel isn't an import or rare enough commodity to risk disturbing this amazing habitat for sea life, including but not limited to orcas, dolphins, and the glass sponge reef.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
187	80 - 3	Robin Spano	Lions Bay, BC	I also oppose the project as a resident of the area who has seen major rejuvenation of marine wildlife in recent years. Gravel isn't an import or rare enough commodity to risk disturbing this amazing habitat for sea life, including but not limited to orcas, dolphins, and the glass sponge reef.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
188	80 - 4	Robin Spano	Lions Bay, BC	I also oppose the project as a resident of the area who has seen major rejuvenation of marine wildlife in recent years. Gravel isn't an import or rare enough commodity to risk disturbing this amazing habitat for sea life, including but not limited to orcas, dolphins, and the glass sponge reef.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
189	81 - 1	J King	Nanaimo, BC	another poison pusher for dollars....when are they going to learn you can not drink or breathe money	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
190	82 - 1	Gerry Prins	West Vancouver, BC	<p>It's time to stop restriction of trade and opposition to marketing Canada's resources.</p> <p>Get on with it, the jobs are needed and it's a product that can be value-added right on the lower mainland.</p> <p>When the area is mined out the locals will have a beautiful fresh water lake on their doorstep.</p> <p>This company is jumping through every hoop to satisfy all concerned</p>	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
191	83 - 1	Jim Noon	Halfmoon Bay, BC	<p>This is copied from the application.</p> <p>"BURNCO proposes to develop its own aggregate source much closer to its existing ready-mix concrete plants in the Lower Mainland. A closer supply of sand and gravel to the Lower Mainland, with reduced transportation costs, will provide more sustainable environmental options to facilitate future viable business growth. The Proponent's three other divisions (i.e., concrete, aggregate and landscape) require access to an aggregate resource to meet projected demands in the BC marketplace. Development of the Proposed Project will result in up to a 280 km one-way reduction in tug and barge tow distance from the current furthest aggregate source (i.e., Port McNeil) to the Proponent's Lower Mainland operations."</p> <p>The LeHigh operation in Sechelt is equidistant from the Lower Mainland. The proponent can continue to source product from Sechelt for many years to come.</p> <p>This project is not a 'more sustainable environmental option.' It's not much more than an opportunity for the proponent to maximize profits.</p> <p>This project is not required and will be a detriment to Howe Sound and nearby residents.</p> <p>I do not support this project.</p>	<p>A further source of aggregate material is required to ensure the reliability of supply. Securing alternate suppliers is not the preferred long-term option for BURNCO as there is too much uncertainty surrounding the ability to supply aggregate material during times of increased demand, in addition to the inability to control the quality and price of material.</p>
192	84 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	<p>There is only so much nature to go around, and precious little near major population centres. BC has a lot of resources. Excavate someplace further from society and preserve our peace and natural near-urban spaces.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
193	85 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I do not support the application based upon the fact that the success or failure of risk mitigation cannot be unequivocally confirmed in advance and, given the only recent ecological recovery of Howe Sound, any degree of potential risk is simply too much.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
194	85 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	In the past 10 years, the Howe Sound recovery has been remarkable. From personally witnessing the first sighting of humpback in decades, to now watching orcas regularly cruise the Ramilles and Montague channels and seeing dolphin even just today, there is no amount of risk that is acceptable when considering any possible jeopardy to the natural habitat or, worse yet, any resumption of a damaged and dying ecosystem. We cannot move backwards when we have come so far.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
195	86 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Langley, BC	I am strongly opposed to the Burnco aggregate project in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
196	86 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Langley, BC	Visually the valley will be destroyed forevermore.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
197	86 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Langley, BC	The constant noise will make the surrounding area untenable for recreational use. Noise travels well across a body of water and will impact all within earshot. This site is too close to existing users of upper Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR D noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
198	87 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	This project should be abandoned.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
199	87 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	It does not provide jobs, and further destroys the environment.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
200	87 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	It does not provide jobs, and further destroys the environment.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
201	88 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	No to industrial development in the Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
202	88 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	This area is the prime tourism destination in BC and creates millions in tax revenue each and every day.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
203	88 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	The view from the new Sea to Sky Gondola will be of an industrial plant.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
204	88 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	How does that make any sense? Let's work to develop tourism further and not fund more short sighted projects that have no use in a future fossil fuel free world.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
205	89 - 1	Janice Wilson	North Vancouver, BC	I feel this project will impact fish and other marine life in the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
206	89 - 2	Janice Wilson	North Vancouver, BC	It will devalue the estuary and increase industrial boat traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
207	89 - 3	Janice Wilson	North Vancouver, BC	It will devalue the estuary and increase industrial boat traffic.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
208	89 - 4	Janice Wilson	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound's water quality and marine life have been making good progress since Britannia was cleaned up and this will be a step backward.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
209	89 - 5	Janice Wilson	North Vancouver, BC	Also, the area has great value for recreational boaters as it is so close to Metro Vancouver, and a new marine trail has been established. Surely McNabb Creek could be incorporated as a recreational destination rather than a gravel pit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
210	90 - 1	Jack Cooley	Brackendale, BC	Minimum to zero change to existing estuary. After the project is finished connect the ocean to the lake.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p> <p>On overflow structure will be installed at closure that will allow the pit lake to spill into constructed offset habitat that connects to the ocean.</p>
211	91 - 1	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	I am writing to voice my/our strong opposition to the large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. is proposing for McNab Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
212	91 - 2	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has had a history of industrial activity and been victim to the effects of mining, pulp and paper, etc for many years. Fortunately it now appears that the Sound is revitalizing, becoming cleaner, and attracting the return of numerous kinds of wildlife.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
213	91 - 3	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	That together with its world class scenery contributes even further to its attraction, and adds a major asset to Vancouver, its residents and our tourist industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
214	91 - 4	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
215	91 - 5	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As well as the wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddle-boarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock, and we feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p> <p>To take a retrograde step and allow an Alberta based company to set up a crushing/gravel pit in this location is both alarming and questionable at best.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
216	91 - 6	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
217	91 - 7	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
218	91 - 8	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	Why should we as British Columbians allow an impact of this nature to our precious environment so close to Vancouver by an Albertan company and for the sake of only twelve jobs!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
219	91 - 9	Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>We believe an approval of this application would be complete lack of foresight. In summary this is a small business opportunity with the potential for considerable environmental impact and yet with zero upside for both residents and visitors to the Lower Mainland and the Sunshine Coast .</p> <p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
220	92 - 1	C Bradbury	Lions Bay, BC	As a resident of Howe Sound I THOROUGHLY OBJECT to the proposed Burnco Gravel Mine for many reasons including the following:	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
221	92 - 2	C Bradbury	Lions Bay, BC	a) the number of permanent full time job opportunities are too few to warrant such environmental destruction.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
222	92 - 3	C Bradbury	Lions Bay, BC	b) as an area of outstanding natural beauty on the doorstep of a ever growing metropolis, this area should be left for the people to enjoy and not or private financial gain.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
223	92 - 4	C Bradbury	Lions Bay, BC	c) natural, indigenous wildlife is slowly but defiantly returning to the once inhospitable Howe Sound, as a generation trying to look forward to a future where we work with the land and not destroy it and everything that depends upon it, this application should have been denied a long time ago.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
224	93 - 1	Frank Rytir	North Vancouver, BC	I AM STONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS PROJECT AS IT IS LAST CENTURY CLOUSE TO VANCOUVER FOR PEOPLE TO ANJOY.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
225	94 - 1	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.  Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
226	94 - 2	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	I live in Brackendale, B.C. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
227	94 - 3	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at- night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
228	94 - 4	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
229	94 - 5	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
230	94 - 6	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Our club is concerned that the dust and the possibility of harmful airborne chemicals released during the processing of aggregate may evolve as a health issue for children and for those with compromised respiratory systems. I personally have respiratory issues and I fear for the affects on my health.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
231	94 - 7	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
232	94 - 8	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
233	94 - 9	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
234	94 - 10	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised. There have been an increased number of paddle boarders this past summer..Our family have enjoyed the safety of peaceful waters this past summer.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
235	94 - 11	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
236	94 - 12	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. Please refer to the attached file. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
237	94 - 13	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
238	94 - 14	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Our friends grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. . This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
239	94 - 15	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
240	94 - 16	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Burnco's reputation as a neighbour in Alberta is known to be adversarial. Citizens of Cougar Ridge have learned, following 10 years of Burnco as their neighbour, that Burnco does not adhere to it's original commitment as they fully understand the limited power within local governments to enforce them to comply.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
241	94 - 17	Karen Richardson	Brackendale, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
242	95 - 1	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p> <p>Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
243	95 - 2	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I live in North Vancouver. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are to protect the pristine condition of Howe Sound. I have travelled to many other countries in the world, and have yet to find such a beautiful place as Howe Sound, so near a big city.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
244	95 - 3	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at- night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
245	95 - 4	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
246	95 - 5	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for its current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
247	95 - 6	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Our club is concerned that the dust and the possibility of harmful airborne chemicals released during the processing of aggregate may evolve as a health issue for children and for those with compromised respiratory systems.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
248	95 - 7	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
249	95 - 8	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
250	95 - 9	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
251	95 - 10	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
252	95 - 11	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
253	95 - 12	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. Please refer to the attached file. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
254	95 - 13	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
255	95 - 14	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Our children and grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
256	95 - 15	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>My family and I watched meteor showers this summer from our boat in Howe Sound: it was a priceless experience. Lights from a gravel mine will almost certainly diminish the night sky. We value this remote area precisely for such advantages as an unobstructed night sky.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
257	95 - 16	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
258	95 - 17	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	At this time, we are unaware of a commitment from Burnco to provide a public forum with which we might monitor and assess compliance to Burnco's original plan.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
259	95 - 18	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	At this time, we understand that there is no current shortage of gravel in the lower mainland.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
260	95 - 19	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	Burnco's mining of this spectacular valley is solely for their profit: we see no local advantage that this mine could provide.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
261	95 - 20	Laurie Dye	North Vancouver, BC	Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
262	96 - 1	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am writing to voice my/our strong opposition to the large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. is proposing for McNab Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
263	96 - 2	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has had a history of industrial activity and been victim to the effects of mining, pulp and paper, etc for many years. Fortunately it now appears that the Sound is revitalizing, becoming cleaner, and attracting the return of numerous kinds of wildlife.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
264	96 - 3	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	That together with its world class scenery contributes even further to its attraction, and adds a major asset to Vancouver, its residents and our tourist industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
265	96 - 4	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
266	96 - 5	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As well as the wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddle-boarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock, and we feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p> <p>To take a retrograde step and allow an Alberta based company to set up a crushing/gravel pit in this location is both alarming and questionable at best.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
267	96 - 6	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR D noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
268	96 - 7	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
269	96 - 8	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	Why should we as British Columbians allow an impact of this nature to our precious environment so close to Vancouver by an Albertan company and for the sake of only twelve jobs!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
270	96 - 9	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	<p>We believe an approval of this application would be complete lack of foresight. In summary this is a small business opportunity with the potential for considerable environmental impact and yet with zero upside for both residents and visitors to the Lower Mainland and the Sunshine Coast .</p> <p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
271	97 - 1	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	I am writing to voice my/our strong opposition to the large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. is proposing for McNab Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
272	97 - 2	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Howe Sound has had a history of industrial activity and been victim to the effects of mining, pulp and paper, etc for many years. Fortunately it now appears that the Sound is revitalizing, becoming cleaner, and attracting the return of numerous kinds of wildlife.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
273	97 - 3	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	That together with its world class scenery contributes even further to its attraction, and adds a major asset to Vancouver, its residents and our tourist industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
274	97 - 4	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
275	97 - 5	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As well as the wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddle-boarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock, and we feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p> <p>To take a retrograde step and allow an Alberta based company to set up a crushing/gravel pit in this location is both alarming and questionable at best.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
276	97 - 6	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
277	97 - 7	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity. I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
278	97 - 8	Mrs. Kristin Leahy Plant	North Vancouver, BC	Why should we as British Columbians allow an impact of this nature to our precious environment so close to Vancouver by an Albertan company and for the sake of only twelve jobs!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
279	96 - 1	Mrs. Shelagh Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	<p>We believe an approval of this application would be complete lack of foresight. In summary this is a small business opportunity with the potential for considerable environmental impact and yet with zero upside for both residents and visitors to the Lower Mainland and the Sunshine Coast .</p> <p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
280	98 - 1	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	As a long time resident of North Van and an active boater in Howe Sound , I do not want the Burnco gravel operation to be built @ McNabb Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
281	98 - 2	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I know Howe Sound very well, having been on the water there since I was a child( many years ago). It has only been the last few years that I have noticed the "return" of many forms of sea life that were absent for decades.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
282	98 - 3	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I know Howe Sound very well, having been on the water there since I was a child( many years ago). It has only been the last few years that I have noticed the "return" of many forms of sea life that were absent for decades.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
283	98 - 4	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am also a member of Thunderbird Yacht Club located @ Ekins Point, Gambier, directly across from the proposed gravel operation at McNabb and we WILL be greatly affected by noise, by dust, by the destruction of the McNabb crab/shrimping grounds and by the disastrous effects of a massive increase in commercial boating traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
284	98 - 5	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am also a member of Thunderbird Yacht Club located @ Ekins Point, Gambier, directly across from the proposed gravel operation at McNabb and we WILL be greatly affected by noise, by dust, by the destruction of the McNabb crab/shrimping grounds and by the disastrous effects of a massive increase in commercial boating traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
285	98 - 6	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am also a member of Thunderbird Yacht Club located @ Ekins Point, Gambier, directly across from the proposed gravel operation at McNabb and we WILL be greatly affected by noise, by dust, by the destruction of the McNabb crab/shrimping grounds and by the disastrous effects of a massive increase in commercial boating traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
286	98 - 7	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am also a member of Thunderbird Yacht Club located @ Ekins Point, Gambier, directly across from the proposed gravel operation at McNabb and we WILL be greatly affected by noise, by dust, by the destruction of the McNabb crab/shrimping grounds and by the disastrous effects of a massive increase in commercial boating traffic.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
287	98 - 8	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	I am also a member of Thunderbird Yacht Club located @ Ekins Point, Gambier, directly across from the proposed gravel operation at McNabb and we WILL be greatly affected by noise, by dust, by the destruction of the McNabb crab/shrimping grounds and by the disastrous effects of a massive increase in commercial boating traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
288	98 - 9	Stephen Leahy	North Vancouver, BC	Do the right thing and deny the permitting of this proposed monstrosity.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
289	99 - 1	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p> <p>Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
290	99 - 2	P J	Yaletown, BC	I live in Yaletown, Vancouver, B.C. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
291	99 - 3	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at- night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
292	99 - 4	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
293	99 - 5	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
294	99 - 6	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Our club is concerned that the dust and the possibility of harmful airborne chemicals released during the processing of aggregate may evolve as a health issue for children and for those with compromised respiratory systems.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
295	99 - 7	PJ	Yaletown, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
296	99 - 8	PJ	Yaletown, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
297	99 - 9	PJ	Yaletown, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
298	99 - 10	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
299	99 - 11	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
300	99 - 12	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. Please refer to the attached file. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
301	99 - 13	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
302	99 - 14	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Our friends grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
303	99 - 15	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
304	99 - 16	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>At this time, we are unaware of a commitment from Burnco to provide a public forum with which we might monitor and assess compliance to Burnco's original plan.</p> <p>Burnco's reputation as a neighbour in Alberta is known to be adversarial. Citizens of Cougar Ridge have learned, following 10 years of Burnco as their neighbour, that Burnco does not adhere to it's original commitment as they fully understand the limited power within local governments to enforce them to comply.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
305	99 - 17	P J	Yaletown, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
306	100 - 1	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
307	100 - 2	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
308	100 - 3	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista. I understand and respect Burnco's work to maximize shareholder value. I am a fan of capitalism. They bought the place on spec and once it is re-zoned they will have made a fortune. But sometimes you lose and this project will put a stopper in developing north Howe Sound into the recreational paradise it should be. Please put the peoples' interest first in this instance. It will send a message that the Liberal government is not just bought. (Calgarybased Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. I consider this amount 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government.)	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
309	100 - 4	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	The Province recently installed a series of camp sites in the sound to improve access for kayak tours. I visited Bain Creek last weekend. A wonderful development of the west coast's southern-most sound. It can be developed into a spectacular wilderness recreation area just an hour from Vancouver. I had friends from Europe up and they could not believe what we have in our backyard. They have to fly to Norway to see anything even close to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
310	100 - 5	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My niece saw orcas and dolphins this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. We caught crabs and prawns. The orcas and prawns are just coming back after Britannia has been cleaned up. Why chase them out again for a little bit of gravel?	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
311	100 - 6	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My niece saw orcas and dolphins this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. We caught crabs and prawns. The orcas and prawns are just coming back after Britannia has been cleaned up. Why chase them out again for a little bit of gravel?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
312	100 - 7	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. I spent last week end there and the current logging operation was running a backhoe way back in the property. The noise was focused by the valley, like in an ancient roman amphitheatre, and really disrupted the peace of the area. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, I can now testify that berms offer little mitigation to sound over water. You still have a point-source of noise that the natural amphitheatre created by the valley will amplify with great efficiency. (I have a Master Degree in Engineering Physics and am confident that the scientists on the review team will agree.) Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running' this simply is not true--and you are welcome to come out to the club to verify this. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
313	100 - 8	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. I spent last week end there and the current logging operation was running a backhoe way back in the property. The noise was focused by the valley, like in an ancient roman amphitheatre, and really disrupted the peace of the area. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, I can now testify that berms offer little mitigation to sound over water. You still have a point-source of noise that the natural amphitheatre created by the valley will amplify with great efficiency. (I have a Master Degree in Engineering Physics and am confident that the scientists on the review team will agree.) Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running' this simply is not true--and you are welcome to come out to the club to verify this. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
314	100 - 9	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	<p>While I was at the dock, a large crew transported roared up the far shore close to McNab. The wake took a while to arrive but the east dock rocked so hard that the old man walking on it had to go down to his knees to avoid being thrown down. I wish I had a video ready. It was a scary how the docks rolled. We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats. We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
315	101 - 1	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. Our club has spent 40 years building and maintaining 2 docks that can handle &gt; 70 boats of all sizes at any given time. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
316	101 - 2	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	<p>My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
317	101 - 3	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	1. The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
318	101 - 4	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	2. Further white noise and	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
319	101 - 5	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	3. wakes are major concerns.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
320	101 - 6	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	Howe Sound was "dead" for years and now since the closures of Woodfibre and Britannia Mines and cleanup, the herring are back in the sound, increasing salmon populations as well as dolphins and orcas.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
321	101 - 7	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	Further the Province recently installed a series of camp sites in the sound to improve access for kayak tours all of which want peace and tranquility not urban white noise. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
322	101 - 8	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	Further, the Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
323	101 - 9	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	Water wakes are also a major concern.. We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats. We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis. Further , and as an owner at Olivers Landing in Furry Creek, spit erosion from wakes and tides has caused foreshore erosion which Squamish District is aware of since 2010 and ongoing discussions are trying to resolve a solution to present problem.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
324	101 - 10	Carl and Carolyn MacRae	Furry Creek, BC	Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application---why do we want to regress back creating again to a "dead" Howe Sound environment. Resonating "white" noise not only affects us but even more importantly, the orcas and dolphins who have come back to our sound. We agree pollution this time is different than chemicals, but one still has to understand it is a form of pollution to our fish habitats.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
325	102 - 1	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. My Husband and I have been avid boaters in BC for the last thirty years and members of Thunderbird Yacht Club for the last nine years. Thunderbird Yacht Club's docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. Our club has spent 40 years building and maintaining 2 docks that can handle > 70 boats of all sizes at any given time.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
326	102 - 2	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	We both attended the Burnco open house which was held on September 12th in Squamish to get answers to our questions and voice our concerns. Over all I was impressed with the level of work which has been done by the EA, and found the information provided helpful. However, we remain opposed to the project for the following reasons;	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
327	102 - 3	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	<p>1. The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista. This project will significantly limit developing north Howe Sound into the recreational paradise it should rightly be.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
328	102 - 4	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	<p>2. The proposal suggests that the ambient noise will not be greater than 35 db's at our location. During the recent logging operation, we could hear trucks backing up, backhoes and other machinery. Sound carries across the water and we remain sceptical that our quiet enjoyment of the channel will not be severely impacted. We can hear loons at McNab creek on any given morning.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
329	102 - 5	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	<p>3. Howe Sound should be be developed into a spectacular wilderness recreation area - in any other area just an hour from Vancouver would a development like this take place? Tourism revenue to this area could far exceed the tax revenue projected as a result of this project and most certainly would create and sustain more than 12 jobs a year.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
330	102 - 6	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	4. The provincial government has been asked numerous times over the last 5 years to treat Howe Sound as one area when considering further development. Since the successful multi-million dollar clean up to the old Britannia Mine site, the sea life has started to recover and regular sightings of Orcas and Dolphins are being reported, and I have witnessed several myself. Why chase them out again for a little bit of gravel? The Sound needs an integrated land and marine use plan that carefully weighs the benefits of development with the potential of Howe Sound as a vibrant, healthy, spectacular destination.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
331	102 - 7	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	5. Commercial boat wakes pose a significant challenge for our club. While I appreciate that the operation is weekdays only, employees will be transported by water taxi from Gibsons, Squamish and Vancouver everyday. Unfortunately, these boats create a significant wake and have damaged our docks and knocked members to their knees. My Dog could not stand up during a particularly large wake and had to lay down to avoid being thrown off the dock. As you likely know, boat operators are responsible for any damage caused by their wake. Should this project go ahead, we will monitor, document and report any damage or injuries as a result.	Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.  There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.  Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.  Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.
332	102 - 8	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	6. This isn't just about a couple of yacht clubs across the channel. Thousands of boaters enjoy the back end of Gambier Island because it is a safe, protected area. The water is warm and very little wind blows through this area making it ideal for recreation of all kinds. The Burnco project will diminish everyone's enjoyment of the channel.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
333	102 - 9	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	Lastly, should this project be approved by the liberal government, I will continue to express my opposition by voting for an alternate party. I was dismayed to learn the level of contribution to the liberal part by Burnco. This hardly seems appropriate given the profits expected to be made by Burnco.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
334	102 - 10	Diana and Ken Lyons	Squamish, BC	I sincerely hope that you deny this application for the good of Howe Sound, local residents, Tourism and BC tax payers.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
335	103 - 1	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. Our club has spent > 40 years building and maintaining 2 docks that can handle > 70 boats of all sizes at any given time. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas. Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
336	103 - 2	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	I reside in West Vancouver and have so for most of my life. I have enjoyed Howe Sound since I was a child spending weekends at our cabin on Passage Island. As an adult and a member of both West Vancouver Yacht Club and Thunderbird Yacht Club, my husband and myself travel extensively in Howe Sound. The beauty of it is worth far more than a gravel pit.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
337	103 - 3	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
338	103 - 4	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
339	103 - 5	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Our club is concerned that the dust and the possibility of harmful airborne chemicals released during the processing of aggregate may evolve as a health issue.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
340	103 - 6	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
341	103 - 7	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
342	103 - 8	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
343	103 - 9	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet.</p> <p>This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats. We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddle-boarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock. We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
344	103 - 10	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
345	103 - 11	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
346	103 - 12	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	We saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNab Creek. . This experience was priceless. At this time, we understand that there is no current shortage of gravel in the lower mainland. Burnco's mining of this spectacular valley is solely for their profit: we see no local advantage that this mine could provide.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
347	103 - 13	Dr. Catherine Mari and Mr. Eric Norlin	West Vancouver, BC	Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
348	104 - 1	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. Our club has spent 40 years building and maintaining 2 docks that can handle over 70 boats of all sizes at any given time. We have spent many tens of thousands of dollars over the years building a club that continues to attract new members as space becomes available through attrition. The peace and beauty of this location is our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes to 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
349	104 - 2	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	As new members of The Thunderbird Yacht Club, our specific concerns are the negative environmental impact the Burnco development will have, not just on the northern areas of Howe Sound but on all of the communities within the sound.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
350	104 - 3	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	The gain belongs solely to Calgary based Burnco Rock Products, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista. I understand and respect Burnco's right to maximize shareholder value but it must be balanced with the protection of our marine environment, particularly one so close to the lower mainland.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
351	104 - 4	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	Thunderbird Yacht Club members spend something in the order of \$160,000 per year in the local communities on fuel, groceries, restaurants and other marine services. We are but a small group compared to the boating community as a whole. If Howe Sound is allowed to become another industrial zone, hundreds of thousands of dollars will vanish from the local economy. In return, Burnco will provide a handful of jobs and the whole economic gain from this development will vacate British Columbia and add to the bottom line of this Calgary based company.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
352	104 - 5	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	Howe Sound is every bit as beautiful as Desolation Sound, yet is only a 2 to 3 hour cruise from the lower mainland of Vancouver, versus a 2 to 3 day cruise to Desolation. This makes it a marine vista that is accessible to countless numbers of people who would never have such an experience if they had to travel for 3 days to see it.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
353	104 - 6	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	After generations of their absence Orcas, Gray whales, Dolphins, star fish, prawns and Dungeness crab are returning to the north sound. This is a result of the cleaning up of past developments that forced their departure. Let's learn from our past mistakes. Given a chance, Howe Sound can return to the pristine marine environment it once must have been. Given half a chance it can become a model of what can be done to protect our world for the generations following us to enjoy and learn from. Let's not force the newly returning marine life to leave yet again.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
354	104 - 7	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	After generations of their absence Orcas, Gray whales, Dolphins, star fish, prawns and Dungeness crab are returning to the north sound. This is a result of the cleaning up of past developments that forced their departure. Let's learn from our past mistakes. Given a chance, Howe Sound can return to the pristine marine environment it once must have been. Given half a chance it can become a model of what can be done to protect our world for the generations following us to enjoy and learn from. Let's not force the newly returning marine life to leave yet again.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
355	104 - 8	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	After generations of their absence Orcas, Gray whales, Dolphins, star fish, prawns and Dungeness crab are returning to the north sound. This is a result of the cleaning up of past developments that forced their departure. Let's learn from our past mistakes. Given a chance, Howe Sound can return to the pristine marine environment it once must have been. Given half a chance it can become a model of what can be done to protect our world for the generations following us to enjoy and learn from. Let's not force the newly returning marine life to leave yet again.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
356	104 - 9	William R. Clark and Patricia M. Clark	Not Stated	Please put the people's interests first. Please turn down the rezoning application that would permit this Burnco project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
357	105 - 1	John S. Cain	Not Stated	A large scale gravel mine continues to press forward at McNab Creek, smack in the middle of the Sound. This is the worst idea ever. Why would this be approved despite the risks and low job creation. Not worthy of the destruction of the land and risk to estuaries. Please consider the harm to the environment and do not allow this application to proceed. I am sure BURNCO can find other opportunities for the aggregate they seek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
358	106 - 1	Tanis Layzell	Bowen Island, BC	Please do not put the gravel pit in Howe Sound. Years of clean up have been done and finally the whales and dolphins are back to Howe Sound. Humans need a tranquil environment as well to get back to nature. Dept. of Fisheries has turned it down 2X. Please get the message that the majority of the people don't want it. Don't make a mess of Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
359	107 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.  Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
360	107 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I live in Squamish and am a past Commodore of the Thunderbird Yacht Club. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
361	107 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>The socioeconomic benefit for the mine is marginal for the area with the potential to have a negative outcome if boaters such as myself find the quiet enjoyment ruined and take our business elsewhere. The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
362	107 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
363	107 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
364	107 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our club is concerned that the dust and the possibility of harmful airborne chemicals released during the processing of aggregate may evolve as a health issue for children and for those with compromised respiratory systems.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
365	107 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
366	107 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
367	107 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
368	107 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
369	107 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
370	107 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. Please refer to the attached file. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
371	107 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
372	107 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>My grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
373	107 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>My family and I watched meteor showers this summer from our boat in Howe Sound: it was a priceless experience. Lights from a gravel mine will almost certainly diminish the night sky. We value this remote area precisely for such advantages as an unobstructed night sky.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
374	107 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
375	107 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Burnco's reputation as a neighbour in Alberta is known to be adversarial. Citizens of Cougar Ridge have learned, following 10 years of Burnco as their neighbour, that Burnco does not adhere to it's original commitment as they fully understand the limited power within local governments to enforce them to comply.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
376	107 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
377	108 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Fort St John, BC	<p>More jobs and positive development are good for this province.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
378	109 - 1	Don Ogden	Vancouver, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. . We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p> <p>Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
379	110 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The protection of Howe Sound's remarkable recovery after decades of industrial abuse is my top concern. Other concerns are:</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
380	110 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
381	110 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place.</li> </ul>	<p>Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
382	110 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the effects on marine life, wildlife, fish etc. be negative (which is very likely) there are no repercussions or any way of turning this project around once it has been approved.</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
383	110 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
384	110 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning the property from current rural to industrial use. The general public clearly does not want this more industry in Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
385	110 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No benefit to the local community and no appreciation for Howe Sound unique biosphere and beauty, only loss of a spectacular valley just 30 minutes from Horseshoe Bay.</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
386	110 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been and would continue to be a decline in property values and natural capital values within the region.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
387	110 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be many long term effects of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
388	110 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley has not been accounted for.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
389	110 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once approved, we all know that they will apply for enhanced future expansion plans of the mine beyond 16 years (could double) and its current size (could double).</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
390	111 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The Future of Howe Sound has been getting support from many parties that all agree that a mine of this nature is a bad idea. Below is a snapshot of who is on our side, but we need your individual voice as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Suzuki Foundation</li> <li>• Environmental consulting firms</li> <li>• GeoTech firms</li> <li>• Marine biologists</li> <li>• BC Stream Keepers</li> <li>• Squamish First Nations</li> <li>• Tourism operators</li> <li>• Yacht Clubs and out-stations</li> <li>• Local municipalities and residents</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries</li> <li>• Local kids camps</li> <li>• Local recreation seekers</li> <li>• Local property owners</li> <li>• International tourists</li> </ul>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
391	111 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The ecological value of this area is so unique that there have also been applications and proposals for large parts of the Howe Sounds to be designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere... or ironically more industrial land!? Please make the right decision.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
392	112 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Why can't the government accept that there has been widespread concern for this project and so many other benefits to using this land as a recreational jewel.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
393	112 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Why can't the government accept that there has been widespread concern for this project and so many other benefits to using this land as a recreational jewel.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
394	112 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Why can't the government accept that there has been widespread concern for this project and so many other benefits to using this land as a recreational jewel.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
395	112 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Below is a snapshot of who is in opposition to this mine going ahead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Suzuki Foundation</li> <li>• Environmental consulting firms</li> <li>• GeoTech firms</li> <li>• Marine biologists</li> <li>• BC Stream Keepers</li> <li>• Squamish First Nations</li> <li>• Tourism operators</li> <li>• Yacht Clubs and out-stations</li> <li>• Local municipalities and residents</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries</li> <li>• Local kids camps</li> <li>• Local recreation seekers</li> <li>• Local property owners</li> <li>• International tourists</li> </ul>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
396	113 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. Our club has spent 40 years building and maintaining 2 docks that can handle > 70 boats of all sizes at any given time. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
397	113 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
398	113 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	1. The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
399	113 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	2. Further white noise and	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
400	113 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	3. wakes are major concerns.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
401	113 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Howe Sound was "dead" for years and now since the closures of Woodfibre and Britannia Mines and cleanup, the herring are back in the sound, increasing salmon populations as well as dolphins and orcas.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
402	113 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Further the Province recently installed a series of camp sites in the sound to improve access for kayak tours all of which want peace and tranquility not urban white noise. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
403	113 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Further, the Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
404	113 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	<p>Water wakes are also a major concern.. We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats. We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis. Further , and as an owner at Olivers Landing in Furry Creek, spit erosion from wakes and tides has caused foreshore erosion which Squamish District is aware of since 2010 and ongoing discussions are trying to resolve a solution to present problem.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
405	113 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application---why do we want to regress back creating again to a "dead" Howe Sound environment. Resonating "white" noise not only affects us but even more importantly, the orcas and dolphins who have come back to our sound. We agree pollution this time is different than chemicals, but one still has to understand it is a form of pollution to our fish habitats.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
406	114 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	12 jobs and the profit of 1 company does not justify the destruction of an area that provides the opportunity to generate more jobs in an industry that is consistent with the brand and reputation of British Columbia	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
407	114 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	...such as tourism and/or real estate development and/or something else that benefits from extraordinary nature.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
408	114 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	...such as tourism and/or real estate development and/or something else that benefits from extraordinary nature.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
409	114 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The scope of thinking on this appears to be very narrow and extremely short-sighted. I do not believe this project is to the benefit of the region or any BC tax payer. There are better options for the region.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
410	115 - 1	Mark Edmonds	Bowen Island, BC	I wholeheartedly disagree with the Burnco Aggregate Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
411	115 - 2	Mark Edmonds	Bowen Island, BC	The damage to the only, largely unspoilt, major estuary in Howe Sound is unacceptable- especially at a time when Howe Sound is finally recovering from decades of abuse. That recovery coming from many hours of professional and volunteer work and a significant amount of taxpayer dollars. I ask the province to reject this proposal.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
412	116 - 1	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
413	116 - 2	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
414	116 - 3	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista. I understand and respect Burnco's work to maximize shareholder value. I am a fan of capitalism. They bought the place on spec and once it is re-zoned they will have made a fortune. But sometimes you lose and this project will put a stopper in developing north Howe Sound into the recreational paradise it should be. Please put the peoples' interest first in this instance. It will send a message that the Liberal government is not just bought. (Calgarybased Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. I consider this amount 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government.)	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
415	116 - 4	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	The Province recently installed a series of camp sites in the sound to improve access for kayak tours. I visited Bain Creek last weekend. A wonderful development of the west coast's southern-most sound. It can be developed into a spectacular wilderness recreation area just an hour from Vancouver. I had friends from Europe up and they could not believe what we have in our backyard. They have to fly to Norway to see anything even close to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
416	116 - 5	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My niece saw orcas and dolphins this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. We caught crabs and prawns. The orcas and prawns are just coming back after Britannia has been cleaned up. Why chase them out again for a little bit of gravel?	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
417	116 - 6	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	My niece saw orcas and dolphins this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. We caught crabs and prawns. The orcas and prawns are just coming back after Britannia has been cleaned up. Why chase them out again for a little bit of gravel?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
418	116 - 7	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. I spent last week end there and the current logging operation was running a backhoe way back in the property. The noise was focused by the valley, like in an ancient roman amphitheatre, and really disrupted the peace of the area. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, I can now testify that berms offer little mitigation to sound over water. You still have a point-source of noise that the natural amphitheatre created by the valley will amplify with great efficiency. (I have a Master Degree in Engineering Physics and am confident that the scientists on the review team will agree.) Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running' this simply is not true--and you are welcome to come out to the club to verify this. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
419	116 - 8	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. I spent last week end there and the current logging operation was running a backhoe way back in the property. The noise was focused by the valley, like in an ancient roman amphitheatre, and really disrupted the peace of the area. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, I can now testify that berms offer little mitigation to sound over water. You still have a point-source of noise that the natural amphitheatre created by the valley will amplify with great efficiency. (I have a Master Degree in Engineering Physics and am confident that the scientists on the review team will agree.) Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running' this simply is not true--and you are welcome to come out to the club to verify this. It is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise we seek get away from at Ekins Point. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
420	116 - 9	Josef Loew	Vancouver, BC	<p>While I was at the dock, a large crew transported roared up the far shore close to McNab. The wake took a while to arrive but the east dock rocked so hard that the old man walking on it had to go down to his knees to avoid being thrown down. I wish I had a video ready. It was a scary how the docks rolled. We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats. We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
421	117 - 1	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Flood prevention dike is not pictured currently. As of July 15 there is hundreds of fallen trees into the creek from wind drawn. This section of creek now has sun 8 hours a day. When 15 years ago it had shade. Giving less than favourable readings. This gives me less confidence in the temperature readings in the environment assessment. Send from info session at Glen Eagle community centre</p>	<p>Temperatures from McNab Creek were used as inputs into groundwater flow model (Appendix 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS) as well as inputs into the pit lake hydrodynamic model. Water from McNab Creek reports to the groundwater system in the valley aquifer. There is no direct surface water connection between the surface water from McNab Creek and the watercourses in the Proposed Project Area.</p> <p>Groundwater temperatures were collected from groundwater wells installed in 2010. Well equipment is programmed to record water pressures and temperature at 15 minute intervals. Since initial installation, the recorded data has been downloaded at regular intervals, with the last download occurring in October 2016.</p> <p>In the groundwater flow model (Appendix 5.5-B of the EAC Application/EIS), groundwater temperature data was used to support the analysis of the water loss from McNab Creek to the valley fill aquifer. When this information was compared to the continuous temperature record obtained from the surface water monitoring stations, it was possible to trace the movement of the thermal front through this aquifer in response to seasonally high temperatures in McNab Creek typically observed in the summer months.</p> <p>For the pit lake hydrodynamic model, the groundwater thermal inputs (described above) were used in the thermal and hydrodynamic modelling of the pit lake to obtain the vertical profiles of water temperature and total dissolved concentration (TDS). This data was used to evaluate long-term effects of pit lake releases to the downstream receiving environment.</p> <p>Changes in surface water temperatures in McNab Creek from 15 years ago due to shading effects would not have affected the analysis presented in the EAC Application/EIS. This is due to the timing of the data collections (2010 to 2016) as well as the lack of connectivity of the surface water of McNab Creek and the watercourses in the Proposed Project Area.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
422	118 - 1	Gabrielle Senoner	West Vancouver, BC	I [redacted] resident of West Vancouver , object to the proposed Burnco Aggregate Mine Project as it is harmful and it affects the north shore West and other surrounding areas in a very devastating scale at the long term . It will affect our quality of life polluting possibly the water and the land. Mining must not be tolerated for the sake of the economy . There must be other ways to help it by not damaging our environment and future generations.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
423	118 - 2	Gabrielle Senoner	West Vancouver, BC	I [redacted] resident of West Vancouver , object to the proposed Burnco Aggregate Mine Project as it is harmful and it affects the north shore West and other surrounding areas in a very devastating scale at the long term . It will affect our quality of life polluting possibly the water and the land. Mining must not be tolerated for the sake of the economy . There must be other ways to help it by not damaging our environment and future generations.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result in a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
424	119 - 1	Pierre Gruget	West Vancouver, BC	<p>In which city can you see a group of 50 elks in pure wilderness? In Vancouver. 35 km from downtown...</p> <p>One morning we were there and saw them, 20 m from us - beautiful. Unique! Wild! And that treasure? At our door.</p> <p>Our grand children will love Vancouver because of that or ... maybe not, depending of what we are going to choose...</p> <p>Another day we saw many salmons jumping out of the water. I would have loved to understand deeply why so many salmons were there? Sure it was because that place is unique for them.</p> <p>An you want to destroy that for sand and gravel you can find everywhere. Why? Laziness? Pleasure to destroy what is unique? Or just because bears elks salmons and other animals don't know how to complain for excessive noise and dust in front of the judge? Sure it cost a little more money to avoid dust and noise...</p> <p>In image and sounds it is: replacing that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI</a> by that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg</a> Which one do you prefer?</p> <p>Please, please don't do that. And protect by law the aera.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
425	119 - 2	Pierre Gruget	West Vancouver, BC	<p>In which city can you see a group of 50 elks in pure wilderness? In Vancouver. 35 km from downtown...</p> <p>One morning we were there and saw them, 20 m from us - beautiful. Unique! Wild! And that treasure? At our door.</p> <p>Our grand children will love Vancouver because of that or ... maybe not, depending of what we are going to choose...</p> <p>Another day we saw many salmons jumping out of the water. I would have loved to understand deeply why so many salmons were there? Sure it was because that place is unique for them.</p> <p>An you want to destroy that for sand and gravel you can find everywhere. Why? Laziness? Pleasure to destroy what is unique? Or just because bears elks salmons and other animals don't know how to complain for excessive noise and dust in front of the judge? Sure it cost a little more money to avoid dust and noise...</p> <p>In image and sounds it is: replacing that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI</a> by that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg</a> Which one do you prefer?</p> <p>Please, please don't do that. And protect by law the aera.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
426	119 - 3	Pierre Gruget	West Vancouver, BC	<p>In which city can you see a group of 50 elks in pure wilderness? In Vancouver. 35 km from downtown...</p> <p>One morning we were there and saw them, 20 m from us - beautiful. Unique! Wild! And that treasure? At our door.</p> <p>Our grand children will love Vancouver because of that or ... maybe not, depending of what we are going to choose...</p> <p>Another day we saw many salmons jumping out of the water. I would have loved to understand deeply why so many salmons were there? Sure it was because that place is unique for them.</p> <p>An you want to destroy that for sand and gravel you can find everywhere. Why? Laziness? Pleasure to destroy what is unique? Or just because bears elks salmons and other animals don't know how to complain for excessive noise and dust in front of the judge? Sure it cost a little more money to avoid dust and noise...</p> <p>In image and sounds it is: replacing that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=orSlhYAI3VI</a> by that <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ch-Y2p-h7Eg</a> Which one do you prefer?</p> <p>Please, please don't do that. And protect by law the aera.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
427	120 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Page 1 of the Executive Summary under Project Description has a major omission. A significant component of this project is the onsite crushing of the materials dredged. Crushing equipment and the process generates significant noise and impacts the zoning of this property. This section makes no mention of the crushing and should be corrected. Omitting rock crushing from the description of the project misleads the reader by attempting to minimize the impact.</p> <p>"Because there is a relatively shallow water table in this area, once the site has been cleared the aggregate resource will be extracted using a clamshell dredge mounted on a floating barge. Aggregate materials will be conveyed to a processing area where sand and gravel products will be stockpiled (Figures 2 and 3). A high efficiency wash plant will use 95% recycled washwater; fines and silt will be removed from the process water for on-site disposal and reclamation. No wash water will be discharged.</p> <p>The processed aggregate material will be conveyed to barges for shipment to BURNCO's existing facilities in Burnaby or Langley (Figure 4).</p>	Crushing of oversized materials, screening and washing were all considered in the effects assessment. The proposed locations of crushers are clearly shown on the operational site layouts drawings presented in the Executive Summary as well as in the EAC Application/EIS.
428	121 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I am writing to oppose the proposed development. I have boated, kayaked and hiked the McNab area for many years. Current logging puts a temporary dent in accessibility but it is seasonal and goes away. The logging noise is clearly audible and disrupting our peace and quiet enjoyment. I find Burnco's statement that at most I will have to put up with the noise of a fridge an understatement of the situation. The logging machines echo across the sound and the proposed 24h rock crushing operation will be the end of my quiet recuperation on the water at McNab.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
429	121 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I am writing to oppose the proposed development. I have boated, kayaked and hiked the McNab area for many years. Current logging puts a temporary dent in accessibility but it is seasonal and goes away. The logging noise is clearly audible and disrupting our peace and quiet enjoyment. I find Burnco's statement that at most I will have to put up with the noise of a fridge an understatement of the situation. The logging machines echo across the sound and the proposed 24h rock crushing operation will be the end of my quiet recuperation on the water at McNab.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
430	121 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I am writing to oppose the proposed development. I have boated, kayaked and hiked the McNab area for many years. Current logging puts a temporary dent in accessibility but it is seasonal and goes away. The logging noise is clearly audible and disrupting our peace and quiet enjoyment. I find Burnco's statement that at most I will have to put up with the noise of a fridge an understatement of the situation. The logging machines echo across the sound and the proposed 24h rock crushing operation will be the end of my quiet recuperation on the water at McNab.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
431	121 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The new kayak campsites the province installed are wonderful but one is just outside McNab and who would want to camp with rock crushing noise ruling the night? Or contend with barges and comuter traffic from Burnco?	Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.  There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.  Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.  Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.
432	121 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The northern sound is a gem of a recreation paradise for us from Vancouver with orcas, seals, salmon, crabs and the occasional gray whale visiting. The province is just finishing the Britannia clean up and the return of wildlife and pristine water is a spectaculare sucess. Why endanger this for a little bit of grave?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
433	121 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The northern sound is a gem of a recreation paradise for us from Vancouver with orcas, seals, salmon, crabs and the occasional gray whale visiting. The province is just finishing the Britannia clean up and the return of wildlife and pristine water is a spectacular success. Why endanger this for a little bit of grave?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity or quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
434	121 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I think it's a bad trade off. Please do not approve this development. In the interest of disclosure, I am not against development as a whole. I support the Kinder Morgan pipeline, the trans mountain (with appropriate investments in safety), site C and the liquefied gas facility up near Squamish. We need development to keep BC prosperous and many developments justify a trade off.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
435	121 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	A hand full of jobs and a faciity blocking access to the only level ground aces in the norther Howe Sound does not meet my cost benefit threshold.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
436	122 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Gravel is not worth the impact a crushing plant will have on the wildlife habitat and human enjoyment of one of the most beautiful sounds in the province.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
437	122 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Gravel is not worth the impact a crushing plant will have on the wildlife habitat and human enjoyment of one of the most beautiful sounds in the province.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
438	122 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Gravel is not worth the impact a crushing plant will have on the wildlife habitat and human enjoyment of one of the most beautiful sounds in the province.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
439	123 - 1	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p> <p>Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
440	123 - 2	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>I live in Nanaimo but visit our Ekins Pt outstation as often as I can. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
441	123 - 3	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise, lights at night and waves. In short, everything that we enjoy at our outstation, which is now at risk.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
442	123 - 4	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club, nor to anyone else trying to enjoy the natural beauty of our west coast. This project disregards the benefits to the province of having such a truly magnificent area like Howe Sound in our own back yard.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
443	123 - 5	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
444	123 - 6	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
445	123 - 7	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
446	123 - 8	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
447	123 - 9	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
448	123 - 10	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised. There have been an increased number of paddle boarders this past summer..Our family have enjoyed the safety of peaceful waters this past summer.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
449	123 - 11	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
450	123 - 12	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermod Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
451	123 - 13	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
452	123 - 14	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our member's grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. . This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
453	123 - 15	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>My family and I watched meteor showers this summer from our boat in Howe Sound: it was a priceless experience. Lights from a gravel mine will almost certainly diminish the night sky. We value this remote area precisely for such advantages as an unobstructed night sky.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
454	123 - 16	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years. At this time, we are unaware of a commitment from Burnco to provide a public forum with which we might monitor and assess compliance to Burnco's original plan.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
455	123 - 17	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Burnco's reputation as a neighbour in Alberta is known to be adversarial. Citizens of Cougar Ridge have learned, following 10 years of Burnco as their neighbour, that Burnco does not adhere to its original commitment as they fully understand the limited power within local governments to enforce them to comply.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
456	123 - 18	Neil McClelland	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration to the concerns of our members.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
457	124 - 1	Pierre Blais	Vancouver, BC	<p>It should move forward, we need to keep our economy growing...I fully support this project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
458	125 - 1	David Sverre	Gibsons, BC	I am an civil engineer and having read the project documentation I believe this is a very sensible and low impact location and approach to obtain aggregates.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
459	126 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Mission, BC	I support this project. We need the good paying jobs and the tax revenue.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
460	127 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Langley, BC	Having reviewed the work and effort done to make this an environmentally responsible project I am in favor of proceeding with this proposal by Burnco. This project will benefit those who live in BC	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
461	128 - 1	Barry Johnson	Mission, BC	I believe we must have it to keep up to the growing demand of our economy to sub stain jobs and demands to all of Canada	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
462	129 - 1	Chris Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	I just graduated from high school and I feel like my childhood playground (the Howe Sound area) is at risk of being permanently damaged. This is a place that should be meant for rest and relaxation, not for industrialization.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
463	129 - 2	Chris Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	The sound of crushing rock does not fit in with this beautiful spot.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRDR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
464	129 - 3	Chris Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	Please consider the negative impact this gravel mine will have on the environment.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
465	130 - 1	Richard Boates	Delta, BC	The construction industry is one of the pillars of the BC economy and employs many thousands of British Columbians. it is also critical to the development of our province. A secure supply of aggregates is critical to the construction industry and will contribute to the prosperity of our province. This aggregate mine is responsible development and must be allowed to proceed for the good of all British Columbians.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
466	131 - 1	Ron Slade	Gabriola Island, BC	I support this project.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
467	132 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Gambier is a beautiful island where lots of family's and friends go to vacation and enjoy the beautiful place. My friends have a cabin over there that they always invite people up and everyone who goes always comes home saying how much fun it was and how beautiful gambier truly is.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
468	132 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Why ruin all of this for a gravel pit that will only create 12 jobs? Don't take away this beautiful place full of memories and homes for a mine project.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
469	133 - 1	Ava	North Vancouver, BC	Please do not destroy Howe Sound with a gravel pit.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
470	134 - 1	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	Howe Sound is the environmental jewel in the Vancouver crown. It is currently recovering from industrial use and is no place an aggregate mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
471	134 - 2	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	I have a degree in Biology and I know the teeming life that abounds and is supported by estuaries. Humans look at intertidal areas filled with grasses and mud and algae and imagine no importance. Mother Nature thrives in these areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
472	134 - 3	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	The newly introduced elk, the returning marine mammals, and hundreds of birds and fish and amphibians rely on this area to remain as it is.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
473	134 - 4	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	At some point people must realize that making money is not the most important thing on this earth, and to impact the earth so fully all in the name of corporate profits is beyond wrong and unreasonable. It is insane and ignorant.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
474	134 - 5	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	McNab Creek is a rare a beautiful part of Howe Sound and no place for a mine. Squamish is an up and coming recreational area for people to come and explore and enjoy the incredible outdoor experiences of Howe Sound. So not only is mother nature at risk, tourism and enjoyment by residents is at risk too.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
475	134 - 6	Sandy McNamee	White Rock, BC	One last thing is the huge impact on the creek itself. It is a fish bearing creek, that would suffer irreparable harm.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
476	135 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Similar to letters sent to you and the BCEAO a few years ago we will continue to question the need for another large scale industrial mine within one of the magical areas of Howe Sound.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
477	135 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This is a place where silence and beauty is so spectacular that you can read a book while hearing only the occasional splash of a seal, the flapping of wings from a blue heron, and the crunching teeth a sea otter while eating his morning fish. This is all while mountains tower straight out of the ocean 3,000 - 5,000 feet in a 360 degree view. Kids paddle board in notoriously calm waters. There is recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife. You may think you are in Alaska but you are only 45 minutes from downtown Vancouver.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
478	135 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This is a place where silence and beauty is so spectacular that you can read a book while hearing only the occasional splash of a seal, the flapping of wings from a blue heron, and the crunching teeth a sea otter while eating his morning fish. This is all while mountains tower straight out of the ocean 3,000 - 5,000 feet in a 360 degree view. Kids paddle board in notoriously calm waters. There is recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife. You may think you are in Alaska but you are only 45 minutes from downtown Vancouver.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
479	135 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This is a place where silence and beauty is so spectacular that you can read a book while hearing only the occasional splash of a seal, the flapping of wings from a blue heron, and the crunching teeth a sea otter while eating his morning fish. This is all while mountains tower straight out of the ocean 3,000 - 5,000 feet in a 360 degree view. Kids paddle board in notoriously calm waters. There is recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife. You may think you are in Alaska but you are only 45 minutes from downtown Vancouver.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
480	135 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>It seems no so long ago that the Howe Sound was so polluted that no one was even interested in enjoying the many wonders of this area. This is not the only area that has had a eye opener. Consider, the dump within the Whistler town center 40 years ago before it was really discovered. The logging dumps in Tofino and clear cutting in Clayoquot Sound, prior to it becoming a UNESCO biosphere or the recent success of the Sea to Sky Gondola in a town that has emerged from a rough industrial history. Even the shores of Vancouver were once filled with heavy industry and is now one of the most livable metropolitan areas in Canada. The beauty of McNab Valley is that it is slightly hard to get to without a boat. However, all the above examples were also once hard to get to. Access to this area will also change someday soon and the monetary value in marine resources and potential tourism dollars, will greatly exceed that of an aggregate mine. The immense benefits this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems is truly spectacular and I'm very disappointed to see new industrial applications being considered for this region. I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
481	136 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Over the past few years there has been so much opposition for this mine. With all this opposition why would it even be considered?? Below is a snapshot of who I have witnesses as being in disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Suzuki Foundation</li> <li>• Environmental consulting firms</li> <li>• GeoTech firms</li> <li>• Marine biologists</li> <li>• BC Stream Keepers</li> <li>• Squamish First Nations</li> <li>• Tourism operators</li> <li>• Yacht Clubs and out-stations</li> <li>• Local municipalities and residents</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries</li> <li>• Local kids camps</li> <li>• Local recreation seekers</li> <li>• Local property owners</li> <li>• International tourists</li> </ul>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
482	136 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Please recognize the economic, sociological and ecological value of this area and that it would do the province much more benefit to be left as a magical recreational area or designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
483	137 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy. Other areas of concern are:	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
484	137 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place from the noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean.</li> </ul>	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
485	137 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the effects on marine life, wildlife, fish etc. be negative (which is very likely) there are no repercussions or any way of turning this project around once it has been approved.</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
486	137 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the effects on marine life, wildlife, fish etc. be negative (which is very likely) there are no repercussions or any way of turning this project around once it has been approved.</li> </ul>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
487	137 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
488	137 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco is has a bad reputation for bullying government agencies, municipalities, parks, fisheries etc. Please don't let them boondoggle you.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
489	137 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no benefit to the local communities and clearly no interest from them to have this mine.</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
490	137 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been and would continue to be a decline in property values and natural capital values within the region</li> </ul>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
491	137 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be many long term effects of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
492	137 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley has not been accounted for.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
493	137 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once approved it is very likely that Burnco will continue to bully and apply for enhanced future expansion plans of the mine beyond 16 years (could double) and its current size (could double).</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
494	137 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BURNCO has donated more than \$200,000 to Liberals and NDP in BC – I wonder why. They are an Alberta based firm.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
495	138 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I have been trying to access the website for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency Burnco project information all day (Sunday 18th September) with no success. Various approaches to get to the information are unsuccessful, it appears the system is hung up or just not responding.</p> <p>The comment period should be extended for those with limited time available, that have limited time to research and review the information.</p> <p>The storyboards summarizing the project that were at the Burnco public information sessions are not posted to the Burnco website as promised. I was discouraged by Burnco staff from taking photos at the public information sessions with the understanding they would be available immediately after Sep 14th. Again, for those not able to make the open house sessions, this information should be transparent and available during the public comment period, especially during the weekends when people are more likely to have time to comment. Having read the story boards some of the comments are related to that content.</p> <p>The public comment period ends September 28th, this should be extended to October 3rd to allow for an extra weekend to allow people the time to review all the information.</p>	<p>The formal Public Comment Period was extended by 5 days (to October 3, 2016) to accommodate those who had difficulties accessing the CEAA online registry. The complete EAC Application/EIS is also available through the BCEAO electronic Project Information Centre (e-PIC, 222.bceao.gov.bc.ca) and BURNCO's Project site (www.burncohowesound.com).</p>
496	139 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Edmonton, AB	I 100% support this project.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
497	140 - 1	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	<p>My name is [redacted] past Strata chair of McNab Creek Estates. Over the past 20 years we have, as you are well aware, AJB and Columbia investment both try and apply for extraction of the Gravel in/on and from the Estuary. On all occasions DFO and the other powers, declined the applications.</p> <p>Burnco bought this property with full awareness of the previous concerns that have not changed.</p> <p>When DFO did not support Burnco, as I understand, they took DFO to court pushing for Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Now here we are again, same concerns .</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
498	140 - 2	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise of rocks dropping into a barge day in and day out echoing on top bellow of the Howe Sound water and in the McNab Valley bowl . - fish disturbance .</p> <p>I've been an avid fisherman of all species as well as the enjoying the abundant prawning and crabbing of the area for those 20 years enjoying the peace and quiet enjoyment . The sealife of any and all types will be negatively effected by the noise.</p> <p>Peace and quiet enjoyment as we know it, will be gone.</p> <p>Sound over water is amplified so much as we are all aware.</p> <p>I'm asking that our peace enjoyment be protected for our kids and there kids</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
499	140 - 3	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise of rocks dropping into a barge day in and day out echoing on top bellow of the Howe Sound water and in the McNab Valley bowl . - fish disturbance .</p> <p>I've been an avid fisherman of all species as well as the enjoying the abundant prawning and crabing of the area for those 20 years enjoying the peace and quiet enjoyment . The sealife of any and all types will be negatively effected by the noise.</p> <p>Peace and quiet enjoyment as we know it, will be gone.</p> <p>Sound over water is amplified so much as we are all aware.</p> <p>I'm asking that our peace enjoyment be protected for our kids and there kids</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
500	141 - 1	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	<p>I am writing you as a concerned citizen , tax payer and resident of McNab Creek. Our Family has been enjoying this prestine area so close to a Vancouver for over 20 years , my extended family have been enjoying this area for more than 50 years . I see NO Environmental benefit to Mining this close to an Estuary , Creek and Ocean</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
501	141 - 2	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	<p>Sound of Gravel going into a huge tin can. ( Further Studies need to be done to understand this Pollution .) - The effects of noise pollution are not as easy to notice as are the other more obvious and visible pollutants like oil spills and marine debris. To what extent these manmade sounds are negatively impacting the oceans is not fully known. The current high noise pollution levels are so recent that many individual marine mammals and fish alive today were born before the problem even arose. The long term impact is simply not yet known.</p> <p>Fish disturbance under water due to noise - The decibel scale for measuring sound follows a logarithmic scale and the actual power of sound increases very fast. A ten decibel increase in sound represents a ten times increase in volume while a 20 decibel increase represents a 100 times increase in volume; a thirty decibel increase in sound represents a 1000 times increase in volume. Sound also travels faster and further in water than in air. High intensity sound in the oceans may not dissipate for thousands of miles. Humpback whales, pictured below, are particularly sensitive to oceanic noise pollution.</p> <p>Salmon live in the estuary and McNab creek for years before there migration .What is the long term impact of these fish There is grave concern that proliferation of these noise sources poses a significant threat to marine mammals, fish and other ocean wildlife. Scientists agree, and a growing body of research confirms, that the</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
502	141 - 3	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	<p>Fine gravel dust over an estuary alive with habitat. Fine dust falling to ocean floor alive with shellfish.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
503	141 - 4	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	Pits and quarries disrupt the existing movement of surface water and groundwater; they interrupt natural water recharge and can lead to reduced quantity and quality of drinking water for residents and wildlife near or downstream from a quarry site.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
504	141 - 5	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	Pits and quarries disrupt the existing movement of surface water and groundwater; they interrupt natural water recharge and can lead to reduced quantity and quality of drinking water for residents and wildlife near or downstream from a quarry site.	<p>Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.</p> <p>Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material's potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.</p> <p>The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
505	141 - 6	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	Tug and Barge Wake disrupting local communities. Hundreds of boaters over the year enjoying McNab beach beside creek.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
506	141 - 7	Neil McClelland	Vancouver, BC	In closing - Rivers flood and shift their courses from time to time, resulting in natural cycles of erosion and deposition of sand and gravel. The extraction of sand and gravel from rivers, streams, floodplains and channels conflict with the functionality of river ecosystems.	An avulsion study of McNab Creek indicated the potential for stream avulsion to affect the Project Area was low and could be further mitigated by construction of a flood protection dyke, which has been incorporated into the project design.
507	142 - 1	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	50 lb salmon caught at McNab creek . We're have all the Salmon gone. We need to protect our environment for our future generations. Howe sound is finally starting to show signs of recovery. Mining has damaged the Howe sound enough.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
508	142 - 2	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	Please leave the estuary alone .	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
509	142 - 3	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	We as humans can study and study but the reality of the situation damage today caused by this potential project will take another 1/2 a generation to repair.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
510	143 - 1	Tracey Saxby	Not Stated	<p>I am writing with regards to two key issues following the BURNCO open house I attended in Squamish on 12th September, 2016:</p> <p>1) I have been trying to access the CEAA website all day (Saturday 17th September) with no success. Please see the attached screenshot showing the error page that shows for the following links related to the BURNCO project:</p> <p><a href="http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/050/document-eng.cfm?document=115251">www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/050/document-eng.cfm?document=115251</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/050/document-eng.cfm?document=53467">www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/050/document-eng.cfm?document=53467</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/050/details-eng.cfm?evaluation=54754">www.ceaa.gc.ca/050/details-eng.cfm?evaluation=54754</a></p> <p>Similarly, clicking on "Find a project" results in a similar error (see "Find a Project" screenshot attached).</p> <p>Searching using "BURNCO" as a search term using the search bar results in irrelevant search results, with the outcome that I haven't been able to access any information from the CEAA site on one of the only days that I have available to review and comment on the proposed BURNCO project.</p> <p>It is important for the CEAA to recognize that public comment and review is more likely to happen on weekends or during weekday evenings as most people have full-time jobs. This is one of the reasons that I have stated in the past that the limited amount of</p>	<p>The formal Public Comment Period was extended by 5 days (to October 3, 2016) to accommodate those who had difficulties accessing the CEAA online registry. The complete EAC Application/EIS is also available through the BCEAO electronic Project Information Centre (e-PIC, 222.bceao.gov.bc.ca) and BURNCO's Project site (<a href="http://www.burncohowesound.com">www.burncohowesound.com</a>).</p> <p>The complete set of display panels are available online through BURNCO's Project site: <a href="http://www.burncohowesound.com/project-overview/public-information-sessions">http://www.burncohowesound.com/project-overview/public-information-sessions</a></p>
511	144 - 1	Marlene Johnson	Not Stated	I totally agree that it should be built.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
512	145 - 1	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
513	145 - 2	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
514	145 - 3	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone. Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
515	145 - 4	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns:</p> <p>Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
516	145 - 5	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life. Disruption to the elk, an at risk species.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
517	145 - 6	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
518	145 - 7	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Compromised air quality due to emissions.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
519	145 - 8	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
520	145 - 9	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
521	145 - 10	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
522	145 - 11	Victoria Smith	Gambier Island, BC	The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
523	146 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	I am a former member of the Sea to Sky Clean Air Society. If I read the assessment correctly, very little onsite monitoring of baseline conditions has been conducted on site and collection of dust sample was done in the month of November. November would not be representative of the dust that could occur in the dry summer months. Why November?	The ambient air particulate monitoring data collected at the Proposed Project site during the month of November was not used to characterize the existing air quality. Instead, background air quality concentrations for TSP, PM10, PM2.5, NO2 and SO2 were characterized using data from existing air quality monitoring networks operated by the BC Ministry of Environment (BC MoE). Background air quality concentrations were established using methods consistent with the BC Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Guideline current at the time of assessment (BC MoE 2008). The method used to determine background concentrations was approved by the BC MoE within the detailed model plan, included in the EAC Application/EIS as Appendix 5.7-E.  The most recent available data from the BC MoE at the time of the assessment was used to establish background conditions: - For the Langdale Elementary station PM10, NO2 and SO2 data were available between January 2010 and December 2013 and data for PM2.5 were available between December 2011 and December 2013. - For the Squamish station PM10 data were only available between January 2010 and January 2011, while PM2.5 data were available between February 2011 and December 2013. Data for NO2 and SO2 were available between January 2010 and December 2013. - For the Horseshoe Bay station PM2.5 data were available between January 2011 and December.  Similarly, the total dustfall results collected at the Proposed Project site were not used to support the application. The metals composition within the dustfall sample was used to support the human health assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
524	146 - 2	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	The air quality data is based on 2013 information. Monitoring equipment at the stations has been upgraded. This upgraded equipment would likely affect the baseline data of the PM2.5 readings. The purpose of upgrading the equipment was to enable more accurate readings of air quality, why is it not being used in this assessment?	<p>During the 2013 monitoring period both the Squamish and Langdale Elementary air quality stations were transitioning their PM2.5 monitor types from TEOMs to BAMs; both TEOM and BAM data were available. Analysis of the data indicated that the TEOM generally reported lower PM2.5 concentrations than the BAM. The assessment used the PM2.5 data from the BAM at the Squamish and Langdale monitoring locations to characterize background concentrations since it was the newer instrument (upgrade) at the location, and also generally provided the more conservative (higher) average background concentrations.</p> <p>The most recent available data from the BC MoE at the time of the assessment was used to establish background conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the Langdale Elementary station PM10, NO2 and SO2 data were available between January 2010 and December 2013 and data for PM2.5 were available between December 2011 and December 2013.</li> <li>- For the Squamish station PM10 data were only available between January 2010 and January 2011, while PM2.5 data were available between February 2011 and December 2013. Data for NO2 and SO2 were available between January 2010 and December 2013.</li> <li>- For the Horseshoe Bay station PM2.5 data were available between January 2011 and December 2013.</li> </ul> <p>Ambient air quality conditions at Langdale Elementary, Squamish and Horseshoe Bay would be influenced by localized urban, commercial and industrial emission sources; emission sources not found in close proximity to the Proposed Project. Therefore, establishing background conditions using data from Langdale Elementary, Squamish and Horseshoe Bay is expected to result in conservatively higher than actual conditions at the Proposed Project site.</p>
525	146 - 3	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	Logging trucks are often travelling through the project area and kick up considerable dust on the gravel road. There is intended to be an increase in trucks with the transportation of the silt collected by truck from the processing area, have the cumulative impacts been considered in the overall air quality predictions?	<p>Proposed Project vehicles will transport the fine (e.g., silt cakes) from the Processing Area to the Fines Storage Area at a rate of approximately one trip per day. The vehicles carrying the fines will be travelling along the current north south road within the Proposed Project Area/fenceline. Mitigation measures to reduce unpaved road dust from Proposed Project roads will include, watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits.</p> <p>The generation of dust along roads due to construction vehicles were included in the dispersion modelling, and were assumed operate all year round even though the rate of use would be limited to will 30 days per year, 14 hours per day. The results of the dispersion modelling are expected to provide conservative predictions related to dust (i.e. higher offsite concentrations) generated by construction vehicles.</p> <p>BURNCO has also committed to continuous air quality monitoring within Section 5.7.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
526	146 - 4	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Marine Resources: I recall commenting during the draft phase about the concern of particulates escaping during barge loading and accumulating over the life of the project over the estuary and affecting the productive marine life. Air Quality section illustration 5.7-4 indicates coarse particulate matter over the estuary. There is shellfish in the project area, samples of crab were collected for the human health study and we have underwater film footage of scallops, crab and prawns not far from the barge loading area. The Consultant for Marine Resources explained there would be no value in a study due to material being "wet" and covered conveyors being used. Once the gravel is crushed and stored, what guaranteed it is still dust free when it is being loaded onto the barge during the hottest and driest time of the year with windy conditions? There doesn't seem to be a design for keeping the aggregate wet during barge loading.</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 5.7.5.3.2 of the application, a number of mitigation measures for fugitive barge emissions will be in place and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Barges will only be travelling loaded in one direction.</li> <li>-The barges will have 2.74 m box walls which will act as partial windscreens.</li> <li>-The loaded aggregate material will be wet (stockpiles will be watered, and material will be moved to barge via covered and bottom feeding conveyors). The frequency of wetting is expected to be increased depending on weather conditions (e.g., during periods of hot, dry weather).</li> <li>-Five of the seven aggregate types will have material silt content less than 1.5%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-material silt content of 14 mm concrete stone, 10 mm concrete stone and 20 mm concrete stone will be 0%.</li> <li>-material silt content of 25 mm crushed rock will be 1%.</li> <li>- material silt content of washed sand (5mm) will be 1.5%.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>BURNCO has also committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will outline activities, triggers and mitigation measures that will be implemented based on changing site conditions (i.e. if a trigger is reached, such as a specific wind speed, mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce the effect; such as postponing barge loading until the wind speeds have dropped). These mitigation measures will be detailed in the Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan which is outlined in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
527	146 - 5	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>What about the cumulative impacts of increased trucking activity on the road on the fish in Harlequin Creek that runs beside the road?</p>	<p>Changes to Surface Water Quality - Suspended Sediments (including the contribution of dust from roads) was assessed as part of the Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat assessment provided in Section 5.1.5.2.1.1 of the EAC Application/EIS. Mitigation measures to reduce this effect are considered sufficient to limit the potential effect to freshwater fish VCs. Such mitigation measures include, watering of unpaved roads and restricted speed limits within the Proposed Project Area to reduce particulate emissions. These mitigation measures will be detailed in the Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan which is outlined in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS. Addition erosion control measures are provided in Appendix 3 (Sediment and Erosion Control Plan) and the Fisheries Habitat Protection and Mitigation Plan outlined in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
528	147 - 1	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	<p>As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
529	147 - 2	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	<p>McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone. Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
530	147 - 3	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns: · Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
531	147 - 4	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
532	147 - 5	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	Disruption to the elk, an at risk species	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
533	147 - 6	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	· Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
534	147 - 7	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	· Compromised air quality due to emissions	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
535	147 - 8	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
536	147 - 9	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
537	147 - 10	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
538	147 - 11	Darci Rosalie	Vancouver, BC	The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
539	148 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What research has Burnco done (in a thorough way) about the financial losses that can be expected by the proposed mine with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) tourism</li> <li>2) recreational boating</li> <li>3) fish and fishing</li> <li>4) health effects of residents</li> <li>5) the loss of the McNabb estuary overall (the only one in Squamish Valley remaining that is relatively intact)</li> <li>6) Financial loss of other existing gravel pits</li> </ol> <p>There needs to be much more careful investigation before this gravel pit is approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
540	148 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What research has Burnco done (in a thorough way) about the financial losses that can be expected by the proposed mine with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) tourism</li> <li>2) recreational boating</li> <li>3) fish and fishing</li> <li>4) health effects of residents</li> <li>5) the loss of the McNabb estuary overall (the only one in Squamish Valley remaining that is relatively intact)</li> <li>6) Financial loss of other existing gravel pits</li> </ol> <p>There needs to be much more careful investigation before this gravel pit is approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
541	148 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What research has Burnco done (in a thorough way) about the financial losses that can be expected by the proposed mine with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) tourism</li> <li>2) recreational boating</li> <li>3) fish and fishing</li> <li>4) health effects of residents</li> <li>5) the loss of the McNabb estuary overall (the only one in Squamish Valley remaining that is relatively intact)</li> <li>6) Financial loss of other existing gravel pits</li> </ol> <p>There needs to be much more careful investigation before this gravel pit is approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
542	148 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>What research has Burnco done (in a thorough way) about the financial losses that can be expected by the proposed mine with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) tourism</li> <li>2) recreational boating</li> <li>3) fish and fishing</li> <li>4) health effects of residents</li> <li>5) the loss of the McNabb estuary overall (the only one in Squamish Valley remaining that is relatively intact)</li> <li>6) Financial loss of other existing gravel pits</li> </ol> <p>There needs to be much more careful investigation before this gravel pit is approved.</p>	<p>Aggregate is a finite resource. No long-term financial impacts to competing operators are anticipated. Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
543	149 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Cumulative Effects - The Box Canyon Run of the River project is upstream from the Burnco project and within the Local Study Area. The concern is that residual effects of the Box Canyon project have not been appropriately assessed. According to Golder's Environmental assessment report many of the studies used as baseline are several years old, and the Box Canyon project was not anticipated to be starting until 2017:</p> <p>Projects and Activities considered in the Cumulative Effects: Volume 2 - 4-37 Box Canyon Run of the River Project states: "Planned future run-of-river hydroelectric project with a capacity of 15 MW and proposed start of 2017". "Habitat compensation is planned for Box Canyon Creek (possibly Marty and Cascara) in the form of rearing habitat for juvenile Coho salmon and cutthroat trout".</p> <p>However, this project began operation earlier this year: July 12, 2016 Clean-Tech Canada online publication: VANCOUVER—Elemental Energy Inc. has announced it has brought its 16 megawatt run-of-river Box Canyon hydroelectric project northeast of Vancouver fully online."</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
544	149 - 2	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>This project is downstream from the Box Canyon project and in the local study area. It does have environmental impacts, in particular noise. The effects on wildlife and fish resulting from and impacts on the residents at McNab must be taken into account.</p>	<p>Cumulative effects due to noise were not assessed because the significance of the noise VC was Negligible, Not Significant. The cumulative contribution of noise from the Box Canyon project is expected to be minimal, based on previous assessments of run-of-river projects (e.g. Narrows Inlet Hydro Project, 2012).</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
545	149 - 3	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>From the Canadian Environment Assessment website Box Canyon project archived information it stated this project would impact fish but escaped an assessment when changes to the fisheries act came into effect:</p> <p>“ flow changes will be experienced within those tributary creeks as well as along approximately 5.7 kilometres of McNab Creek between the confluence with Cascara at the upstream end and Box Canyon Creek at the downstream end. In addition flow ramping effects will likely have an effect to the mouth of McNab Creek. All diverted water is proposed to be delivered to a single powerhouse located on the banks of McNab Creek, approximately one kilometre (1 km) upstream of the confluence of Box Canyon Creek.</p> <p>..... In particular, Fisheries and Oceans Canada will pursue the assessment of impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed hydroelectric power facility on fish and fish habitat, and determine the required mitigation for impacts and compensation for residual impacts. Further details or changes to the scope will be posted if other Federal agencies and departments are required to provide input or issue an approval for any of the project components.”</p> <p>On July 6, 2012, the new Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 came into force which replaced the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. As a result, there is no longer a requirement to complete the environmental assessment of this</p>	<p>Cumulative effects to fisheries and freshwater were not assessed because the significance of the VCs was Negligible, Not Significant following the implementation of proposed mitigation (esp., Offset habitat).</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
546	150 - 1	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	My family and I are members of the Thunderbird Yacht Club as well as the Squamish Yacht Club and use the area around the proposed Burnco gravel pit extensively. We use the Thunderbird outstation directly across from the proposed gravel pit and also use the entire waterway for a variety of marine activities. This area consistently has the warmest and calmest waters in Howe Sound making it ideal for recreational boating, waterskiing, wakeboarding, swimming, canoeing, kayaking and using stand up paddleboards. It is a highly valued recreational asset and one that will continue to grow in popularity. Not only will an additional industrial operation negatively impact the mostly natural setting in the area but it will also have negative impacts on recreational use and enjoyment of the area. Ideally another site could be chosen for this type of operation. I attended the open house in Squamish to get a clearer picture of the project and its impact. I came away from the open house believing that Burnco is doing what they can to minimize impacts.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
547	150 - 2	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	However, I have a couple of areas of concern that I would like addressed: 1) Hours of operation a. Burnco insisted that they will operate Mon-Fri daylight hours only This would be a good step as most recreational usage in this area occurs on weekends. Can you confirm that Burnco will not be permitted to work on weekends? If they can get out of this commitment to daylight/weekday only operation the impact of the project will be greatly increased. Can you also confirm the maximum number of hours per day that the plant would be permitted to operate. I believe no longer than a 10 hour day should be permitted although daylight hours extend beyond 10 hours/day in the summer peak recreational use period.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
548	150 - 3	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	2) Noise Impacts a. Burnco insists that the increase in sound levels will not be apparent or significant at Ekins Point where the Thunderbird Yacht Club is located. What is our re-course if this is not the case? Can we ask them to shut down their operation if there is an increase in sound levels beyond what they assured us would be the case? Can you confirm that corrective actions will be required if the noise impacts are greater than anticipated and that the plant will not be permitted to operate until appropriate mitigation is completed?	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
549	150 - 4	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	<p>2) Noise Impacts</p> <p>a. Burnco insists that the increase in sound levels will not be apparent or significant at Ekins Point where the Thunderbird Yacht Club is located.</p> <p>What is our re-course if this is not the case? Can we ask them to shut down their operation if there is an increase in sound levels beyond what they assured us would be the case? Can you confirm that corrective actions will be required if the noise impacts are greater than anticipated and that the plant will not be permitted to operate until appropriate mitigation is completed?</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>
550	150 - 5	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	<p>3) Light impacts</p> <p>a. According to the operating plan there will be no night time operation.</p> <p>This would be a positive outcome that would not contribute to the existing lighting impacts from the Port Mellon facilities. I would like Burnco to go further and confirm that security lighting and any other required lighting on the site be minimized, be ground facing and targeted. Ideally all lighting requirements can be met by lighting inside structures and with no impact on the shoreline. Docking facilities should be lit according to the requirements for safety only. I would like to see a more highly developed lighting plan that can be held up to scrutiny.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
551	150 - 6	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	<p>Having visited the open house and discussed many aspects of the project with Burnco staff and contractors these are my primary concerns related to the project. The operational plan as described seems appropriate but I would like confirmation that the above operational plans and schedules must be adhered to or the plant will not be permitted to operate. If the plant cannot operate within the operational corridor they have described in the public meetings than it must be shut down. Please insure that this is the case.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
552	150 - 7	John Heilig	Squamish, BC	<p>On a final note, has the possibility of a fixed link traversing this section of the Sunshine Coast been considered in the planning for this facility? If a fixed link follows the alignment along this section of the Sunshine Coast it would seem wise to consider what more valuable uses this estuary/beach and large upland valley might be used for eg. housing and parkland to accommodate the expanding housing needs of the lower mainland.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. A list of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities considered is provided in Table 4-7 of the EAC Application/EIS (Part B, Section 4.5.5). A fixed link connecting the Sunshine Coast is not considered to be a reasonably foreseeable within the life of the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
553	151 - 1	Alan Martin	North Vancouver, BC	As a recreational user of Howe Sound, and acknowledging the immense benefits this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems, I am disappointed to see large-scale industrial applications being considered for this region. Although aggregates are an essential part of our industrial base, this form of operation would be better suited to other locations characterized by a lower risk to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
554	151 - 2	Alan Martin	North Vancouver, BC	As a backyard to Vancouver, and gateway to Whistler, Howe Sound represents a natural wonder, whose worth resides in its natural splendor. The wonder of this region has been exemplified by the return of sardines and anchovies, which in turn support salmon, dolphins and humpback whales, which have also been reported in increasing numbers. The monetary value in these marine resources, in terms of potential tourism dollars, will greatly exceed that of an aggregate mine.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
555	151 - 3	Alan Martin	North Vancouver, BC	The monetary value in these marine resources, in terms of potential tourism dollars, will greatly exceed that of an aggregate mine. Please consider these comments and those by countless others in your decision making process.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
556	151 - 4	Alan Martin	North Vancouver, BC	Please consider these comments and those by countless others in your decision making process.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
557	152 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>I'm writing to voice my opposition to a large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. proposes for McNab Creek on the Sunshine Coast in Howe Sound. Thunderbird Yacht Club's sole set of docks are located directly opposite the proposed site and on the north shore of Gambier Island. We are a group of 115 members and families who motor or sail to Ekins Point from marinas located all over the lower mainland. We have spent many thousands of dollars and countless months building a club that continues to attract new members with the attrition of our original members. It is likely the peace and beauty of this location that remains our strongest marketing tool: remote and yet only 30 minutes - 2 hours travel away from our local marinas.</p> <p>Please decline Burnco's request for a mining permit for McNab Creek.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
558	152 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>I live in Nanaimo but visit our Ekins Pt outstation as often as I can. My specific concerns about a mine in this location are:</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
559	152 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise, lights at night and waves. In short, everything that we enjoy at our outstation, which is now at risk.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
560	152 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys our peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces our ability to attract new members. This project brings no economic or social advantage to our club, nor to anyone else trying to enjoy the natural beauty of our west coast. This project disregards the benefits to the province of having such a truly magnificent area like Howe Sound in our own back yard.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
561	152 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
562	152 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of 'white' urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that we seek out this area for it's current peace and silence. The Canadian media reported this week of the findings of industrial noise that negatively affect sea mammal populations in the St. Lawrence River. Howe Sound has recently enjoyed the return of Orcas, dolphins and an occasional grey whale. These sightings are considered priceless by our club.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
563	152 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
564	152 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
565	152 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our members use the foreshore area/estuary (the sole estuary in the area) of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to our small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that could diminish our interest in returning to this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
566	152 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>We have found over our 4 decades at our docks that water taxis and commercial tug/barge traffic produce wakes large enough to cause damage both in short term and over time. Boats that are moored without adequately-placed protection from their fenders are pounded against our docks. We have experienced wakes hitting our docks from boats passing (at all speeds) that have knocked members off their feet. This has required nearly yearly repair and maintenance of the docks. Burnco's application indicates that there is no expected adverse effects from the wakes of increased traffic of water taxis and tug boats.</p> <p>We know unequivocally this statement to be untrue: not only for our docks but for all docks and the foreshore of Thornbrough and Ramilies Channel. Boat owners will be unwilling to anchor in the beach/foreshore area directly in front of the proposed site due to the risk of damage from the high wakes of the expected and frequent water taxis.</p> <p>The wakes of commercial vessels listed above also present risks to kayakers, paddleboarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Many of our children have learned to swim at this dock.</p> <p>We feel that our safety on the water could be compromised. There have been an increased number of paddle boarders this past summer..Our family have enjoyed the safety of peaceful waters this past summer.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
567	152 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>In 2012, we determined that Thunderbird Yacht Club spent \$161,054.00 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. This amount can only have increased since that time. If our membership or our interest in Howe Sound is diminished, the business that we bring to the Sunshine Coast could be similarly lessened.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
568	152 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermod Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. One can only wonder why Burnco would donate such a large amount to the current government.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
569	152 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our docks and we use this remote and pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation for their children's enjoyment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
570	152 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Our member's grandchildren saw whales /dolphins/deer/otters this past summer in Howe Sound opposite McNabb Creek. . This experience outside of their usual city life was priceless and unforgettable. What is the dollar value placed on a child (or any adult for that matter) seeing a whale for the first time?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
571	152 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>My family and I watched meteor showers this summer from our boat in Howe Sound: it was a priceless experience. Lights from a gravel mine will almost certainly diminish the night sky. We value this remote area precisely for such advantages as an unobstructed night sky.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
572	152 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Burnco executives will not commit to complete this project in 16 years: they have been quoted as intending to maximizing this resource. It remains uncertain if Burnco will wish to extend beyond 16 years. At this time, we are unaware of a commitment from Burnco to provide a public forum with which we might monitor and assess compliance to Burnco's original plan.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
573	152 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Burnco's reputation as a neighbour in Alberta is known to be adversarial. Citizens of Cougar Ridge have learned, following 10 years of Burnco as their neighbour, that Burnco does not adhere to it's original commitment as they fully understand the limited power within local governments to enforce them to comply.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
574	152 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration to the concerns of our members.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
575	152 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	Nanaimo, BC	<p>Again we encourage you to decline Burnco's application: their profit isn't worth the ill will that this project brings to Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
576	153 - 1	Stephen Burgoyne	Nelson, BC	Let's get digging as soon as possible.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
577	154 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	I feel very strongly that there should be NO industrial development like this in Howe Sound	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
578	155 - 1	Rob Stokes	North Vancouver, BC	Please accept this submission as opposition to the proposed gravel pit located at McNab Creek by BURNCO. The entire north end of Howe Sound is finally showing signs of environmental recovery after years of sustained commercial use and abuse. To allow such a gravel pit to be created/maintained would not only partially destroy one of the last pristine valleys in the area, but would also jeopardize the natural healing of both land and sea that's now occurring. The risk is simply not worth it.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
579	155 - 2	Rob Stokes	North Vancouver, BC	In addition to this, the area is now becoming more and more popular as an area of recreation - used by boaters (power and sail), hikers, divers, kayakers/canoists and beach goers etc.. Two vital yacht clubs (Burrard and Thunderbird) are pro-active stakeholders in foreshore lands directly across from the proposed site and as active stewards of their respective properties, stand to be extremely negatively impacted should the proposal proceed.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
580	155 - 3	Rob Stokes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I'm in favour of the responsible use of natural resources to assist in driving an economy. But in this case, the economic benefit to the public is far outweighed by the economic benefit to BURNCO themselves. There is virtually zero benefit to local business and to local people themselves – no benefit to the public as a whole. Anticipated employment numbers are low - anticipated community benefit is also low.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
581	155 - 4	Rob Stokes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Some projects make sense - this is not one of them. Some projects require the public to "suck it up" as the project is for the benefit of the population - this is not one of them. And some projects provide such a positive economic gain that they truly deserve to be viewed under diffuse light - this is not one of them.</p> <p>This project fails on many fronts - so many in fact that it simply cannot be allowed to proceed. I respectfully request that you deny this application and work with BURNCO to find an alternate source of gravel that does not have the same adverse effect on so many people and on such fantastic lands.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
582	156 - 1	Henry Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	This project will adversely affect the value of our property at Ekins Point that my Yacht Club (Burrard Yacht Club) has developed over the last 25 years. It will largely destroy the serene quiet of air and water, has a high risk of pollution not withstanding Burnco's hopes, will destroy the last pristine valley in Howe sound and the only sand beach in the Sound, is a serious risk to the wonderful increase in the return of Herring, Salmon, Dolphins and Whales. In other words it will directly and badly affect the enjoyment of our property for our 400 members.	The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.
583	156 - 2	Henry Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	This in light of the minimal benefit to BC people; the main gain will be Burnco, and we will lose the wonder and magic of this place for 3 generations (including recovery time).	Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Benefits of the Proposed Project include: - capital expenditures (\$21.5 million), - operational expenditures (\$13 million/year), - direct, indirect and induced employment, and - taxation revenue.  Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.  BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.  Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are: - Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses; - Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel; - New amphibian breeding habitat ; - Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.
584	156 - 3	Henry Gerber	North Vancouver, BC	I realize that Burnco has contributed over a quarter of a million dollars to my BC Liberal Government! Don't let that influence your decision. Decide in the favour of the several million people of the lower mainland who want this Sound saved.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
585	157 - 1	Jay Werner	Langley, BC	I am totally against this project. Howe Sound is a place my family spends a lot of time. We have seen dolphins playing, others have seen orcas. Just two weeks ago my four year old son and I were crabbing just off McNabb creek. We had beached our dinghy and we're playing in the mud on shore building lifetime memories. Our yacht clubs' very popular outstation is across the bay. I would be very saddened to see this special place ruined by an industrial gravel plant with barge traffic too!! 😞	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
586	157 - 2	Jay Werner	Langley, BC	I am totally against this project. Howe Sound is a place my family spends a lot of time. We have seen dolphins playing, others have seen orcas. Just two weeks ago my four year old son and I were crabbing just off McNabb creek. We had beached our dinghy and we're playing in the mud on shore building lifetime memories. Our yacht clubs' very popular outstation is across the bay. I would be very saddened to see this special place ruined by an industrial gravel plant with barge traffic too!! 😞	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
587	157 - 3	Jay Werner	Langley, BC	I am totally against this project. Howe Sound is a place my family spends a lot of time. We have seen dolphins playing, others have seen orcas. Just two weeks ago my four year old son and I were crabbing just off McNabb creek. We had beached our dinghy and we're playing in the mud on shore building lifetime memories. Our yacht clubs' very popular outstation is across the bay. I would be very saddened to see this special place ruined by an industrial gravel plant with barge traffic too!! 😞	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
588	158 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Land Use, Social and Economic impacts: The current Rural zoning reflects land use as determined by the Sunshine Coast Regional District. BURNCO has submitted an application for rezoning however, this application has not made any progress. BURNCO must assume this zoning will be changed as an alternative plan is vague. The knowledge it will forever be a major disruption to this area, particularly to the immediate neighbors and users of this area that value the peace and opportunity to be off grid. BURNCO claims it will bring value to the neighbors by providing power to their homes however, these property owners have chosen this way of life the value of which cannot be measured. Generations of people have enjoyed the privately held land next to this proposed mine.	BURNCO's rezoning application has been submitted to the SCRD who have advised that they are waiting for the outcome of the environmental assessment. The SCRD is an active participant in the Technical Working Group that is reviewing the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
589	158 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	This area has been frequented by thousands of children over the decades from nearby children's camps and recreation areas. The property owners, outstations, campers, kayakers and anglers that come to McNab Creek do so to enjoy the peace and quiet. Intermittent disturbance from logging, the odd cruise ship passing are nothing in comparison to the constant disturbance from the noise of this gravel mine.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
590	158 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Howe Sound currently has industrial zoned areas. Increasing industrial activity in the quiet areas valued for recreation is contrary the best use of this land. The Social Impacts under the Environmental Assessment is the most flawed part of this process. During the first round of public comments, the proponent and those determining the "Valued Components" seem to have dismissed the many comments from the public. Where is it reflected in the "value components the many comments related to the need for a long term plan for the Howe Sound region? Comments that reflect the social/emotional value are dismissed - for example: "My Father is now approaching his 80th Birthday and he is still going to McNab every weekend May thru September to continue improving his most treasured spot. He is not alone though, my Brother and I along with 6 grandchildren are there as well! We can't get enough of the beautiful scenery, quite peaceful days and the clean fresh air. McNab Creek is not only my father's life line it is his legacy!". Comments such as this reflect the sentiments of those that value the more remote parts of Howe Sound. "Pasley Island is located in the southwest part of Howe Sound, and is inhabited by a community of over 200 people who have seasonal residences located on the perimeter of the island. Residents are governed by the Islands Trust and the Sechelt Regional District. No utility services are provided from the mainland. Our residents treasure the existing natural environment, and stewardship of resources is a community priority. Our residents engage in many water sports and many kinds of fishing."	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
591	158 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The process minimizes and dismisses the emotional connection people have with this area. The only "valued components" assessed under the social impacts are any need for additional housing or emergency services. How is it justified to dismiss these emotional but very important social values?	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
592	158 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	No survey or consultations has been conducted by the proponent to quantify the real economic or social impact of this project, however there are thousands of people who have signed a petition opposing this gravel mine at McNab Creek. BURNCO's approach is "you call us" if you want to know more but there is no evidence of BURNCO having proactively sought out its neighbors in the area since they purchased the property.	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project life has been reduced from 20-30 years to 16 years, and the maximum depth of excavation has been reduced from 55 metres to 35 metres;</li> <li>- There are no proposed discharges to, or withdrawals from, McNab Creek;</li> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Reduced the size of the pit lake as the northern edge has been moved away from the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke.</li> <li>- Pit lake designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. The elevation of the pit lake will also be used to manage base flows in the natural groundwater watercourses below the pit lake.</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Areas progressively reclaimed during the operational phase will be re-vegetated to control erosion.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> <li>- Replaced wash water sedimentation ponds and associated discharges with a 95% efficient wash plant that uses recycled water from two large storage tanks. The 5% loss (via retention, evaporation and absorption) will be supplemented with make-up water from a ground water well. No wash water will be discharged.</li> <li>- Fines generated from the crushing, screening, washing of material will be extracted from the wash water and mechanically dried and compressed into sediment cakes which will be used in progressive reclamation of the onsite fines disposal area.</li> <li>- Covered or enclosed Project components and/or operating under wet conditions (e.g., fine water spray) to reduced potential</li> </ul>
593	159 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	Terrestrial Vegetation and Economic impacts – In a 1997 21 minute aerial view of McNab Creek and the valley proposed to be mined, shows this area well covered by forest. Has the economic and environmental value of removing trees permanently from this area been fully considered into the economic gains and losses? From the EA: "The Proposed Project Area evaluated during the baseline assessment was approximately 70 ha in size; subsequent refinement of the Project equates to a footprint of 59.9 ha. The footprint is primarily situated within previously harvested areas."	<p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Loss of extent (site clearing and construction of the mine area, conveyor, processing area, and marine loading conveyor) was an effect considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
594	159 - 2	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>When speaking with the Golder Consultants and BURNCO representatives at the public information sessions, their narrative was this area has been previously industrialized due to logging. This seemed to be a rationalization for mining. The EA Summary states: "Much of the Proposed Project area is in various stages of regeneration following logging".</p> <p>This project area has a privately managed forest and forestry is at least renewable. Even during growth, trees and vegetation provide habitat for wildlife. According the Natural Capital assessment for Howe Sound conducted by Suzuki Foundation – Molnar 2014, the value of ecosystem benefits from forests is on the low end \$5,045 up to \$11,820 per hectare.</p> <p>Replacing a renewable enterprise with a non-sustainable one is not in the best interest of the future generations. Where and how is the loss of revenue from the permanent removal of trees calculated?</p>	<p>The loss of wildlife habitat was described using wildlife habitat suitability index models and habitat associations as described in Section 5.3.1.5 of Volume 2, Section 5.3. A detailed vegetation assessment and discussion on proposed Project effects to vegetation is described in Section 5.3.2, Volume 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>The terrestrial LSA is 569 ha in size and does not contain any old growth forest. Approximately 20.0% (113.8 ha) of the Terrestrial LSA is considered mature forest, occurring mainly on the east side of McNab Creek, and as elevation increases from the valley bottom on either side of the LSA. These areas could be considered merchantable timber. Merchantable timber will be salvaged on site.</p> <p>The trees and vegetation where the pit lake is planned will be permanently lost (28.2 ha). However, reclamation activities post-closure will re-establish mature forest on site. Roosevelt elk winter habitat will be restored through the creation of 24.3 ha of mature forest over approximately 25 years. In addition, a total of 31 ha of moderate to high suitability Roosevelt elk habitat (based on habitat suitability index modelling) to the north, east and south of the Project area will be protected and left unaffected by the Project. Establishing mature forest will also provide suitable habitat for other mature forest species such as northern goshawk and marbled murrelet. Therefore, the removal of trees to establish the pit lake will be compensated for.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
595	160 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Short term jobs, and minimal permanent jobs need to be offset against the loss of opportunity for other jobs resulting from this gravel mine such as jobs related to the construction industry and services provided to the other property owners in the area.</p> <p>BURNCO currently purchases its supply from other sources in the province so the rationale for this mine is to benefit BURNCO with no benefit accruing to the future generations. Mr. Scott Burns, CEO of BURNCO was overheard stating at the public information meeting that the financial losses incurred from this operation in BC will be carried over to offset profits from his Alberta operation. It is logical a corporation would structure their companies to ensure they pay the least taxes. The longer BURNCO can spread out the losses from this operation the greater benefit to the owners.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
596	160 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The communities around Howe Sound have been calling on the government for a comprehensive land and marine use plan for many years now. The assessment by the proponent's consultant on the socio-economic impacts of any one project on the long term future of Howe Sound should is not good enough.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
597	160 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>BURNCO's business case, according to the Operations Manager is based on 4 10 hour shifts and 6,000 tonne barge loads that take 3 hours to load, one barge load every other day. BURNCO's story boards and some of the BURNCO staff at the public information sessions stated the maximum to be mined is 16 million tons over 16 years, but the EA states 20 million tons. What limits the amount of aggregate and the life of the project? What assurances do the public have this project will not expand? Responses from BURNCO staff were vague.</p> <p>It is stated in the documentation that "The actual commercially-extractable aggregate resource volume will be revised depending upon the information and design of the mine plan and the aggregate resource evaluation, but is expected to average 1,000,000 tons per year." Previous studies suggest 51 million tons or 46.5 million tons. Can BURNCO confirm and/or commit to only mining the amount described in the Environmental Assessment Certificate application? What is the probability of BURNCO expanding the mine after the aggregate resource evaluation? What is the current aggregate resource evaluation? Can BURNCO confirm the 20 million tons is the extent of the excavation or is it marketable gravel (meaning more than 20 million tons will eventually be extracted)?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
598	160 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>There is conflicting information in the application. Some VC sections state that the construction period will be up to 2 years, whereas in other sections (e.g., noise) it states that construction will be 4 months. Can BURNCO confirm?</p>	<p>The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.</p>
599	160 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>What is the forecasted demand for aggregate in the Lower Mainland during the life of the proposed project? What is the supply of aggregate from all sources in the Lower Mainland during the proposed project?</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
600	160 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	How can BURNCO be sure that the project will not significantly affect the ecological thresholds , self-sustaining populations and the ecological resilience of marine resources in Howe Sound?	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
601	160 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Where does it prove BC will be at a crisis in terms of gravel supply? There are many BC based businesses operators currently supplying the market. Many gravel operators along our coast are shipping their gravel outside the province (Sechelt mine). If the local market was in crisis, shouldn't keeping BC's natural resource within the province be a priority? What proof or condition is placed on the proponent to require them to supply the local demands? The gravel from McNab Creek would be shipped to BURNCO's existing facilities replacing the gravel it currently purchases from other suppliers up the coast thereby replacing current jobs, not guaranteeing additional jobs in the market. What is the impact on the current suppliers to BURNCO and has this offsetting been factored into the labor market calculations?	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed in our area, aggregate materials will have to be hauled by truck from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
602	161 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>This comment was submitted during the draft AIR – with a response” An assessment of potential effects on a range of valued components, including acid rock drainage and consequences on water drainage will be provided in the EAC Application/EIS.” Were these reports referred to in this comment received and referenced? Ted Franklin - Lions Bay, British Columbia To Mr. Gerry Hamblin (Project Assesment Manager) Acid Drainage will destroy the McNabb Creek River and Estuary as well as continue to leach into the soil and ocean for many years to come. I have two detailed reports, one is a Geochemical Report Owner Silverado Mines Operator Tri-Con Mining Mineral Resources Assessment Report#7935 performed at NcNabb Creek dated March 12, 1980 by Wayne Morton P. Eng and Geologist. Mr. Morton and associates did a detailed study of McNabb Creek. 370 samples were collected from the McNabb Creek Area and shipped to Chemex Labs in North Vancouver for analysis. Page 2 of the report the Geoligist concludes that " Mineralization is in the form of Pyrite, chalcopyrite and molybdenite with minor bornite. Sulphides may occur either on dry fractures or accompany quartz veinlets". Sulphide grains are altered to hematite and the surface of the exposed bedrock is fresh" 3The second report is from Enridge Pipelines which details the Howe Sound Sea To Sky Highway Project as an example of extremely high levels of Sulphites that are exposed when rocks were blasted or crushed in Howe Sound and the problems of how to remove the acidic rock and the acid water created as the sulphite is exposed to oxygen and water. The report ststes that Pyrite has extremely high sulphites released which causes acidic water and destroys life in</p>	<p>Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.</p> <p>Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material’s potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.</p> <p>The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.</p>
603	162 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>This has to be one of the most absurd projects i've seen considered.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
604	162 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The Howe Sound has finally been rehabilitated with ocean life coming back. It has moved toward being a recreation center as opposed to a heavy industry center.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
605	162 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>You have to consider: 1. The vast amount of recreational zoning that has taken place recently in the Howe Sound. This mine will have a massive impact on the ability of residents and visitors to enjoy the sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
606	162 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	2. The noise impact on ocean wildlife which has recently returned to the sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
607	162 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	3. The limited financial benefit to the province. It is clear there are very few jobs at stake. The future of the province is not in these types of projects.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
608	162 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	4. Allowing a Calgary company in to BC to destroy our landscape is completely unacceptable.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
609	163 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>In response to the public's concerns about the recovery of Howe Sound BURNCO stated "BURNCO understands your concerns for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the project site and surrounding area,including Howe Sound. "</p> <p>It would be helpful to know what ongoing work has been conducted to improve the existing fish compensation channel on the property. In 2001 DFO and HSLP signed an agreement under the Fisheries Act with the objective to ensure the loss of fish habitat due to the annual dredging of Rainy River is offset. What is the life of this commitment and wouldn't this condition carry over to any new owner of the property? If the compensation channel is not productive as intended, how has BURNCO invested in this channel on its property to fulfill the obligation?</p> <p>Besides staff participating in a shoreline cleanup at other locations and installing bat boxes, what stewardship has BURNCO undertaken on its property and in Howe Sound to make ongoing improvements to the environmental recovery over the past eight years?</p>	<p>BURNCO has historically supported the communities in which it operates in the form of sponsoring community events, raising money for charities and various forms of donation.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the existing fish compensation channel, BURNCO has been monitoring its effectiveness and conducting fisheries surveys throughout the property since acquiring the site in 2008.</p>
610	164 - 1	Martin Richmond	Lions Bay, BC	I'm opposed	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
611	164 - 2	Martin Richmond	Lions Bay, BC	the estuary is more important than the mine to me.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
612	164 - 3	Martin Richmond	Lions Bay, BC	The extra traffic in Howe Sound could be a safety issue.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
613	165 - 1	Allan Sutherland	West Vancouver, BC	I have been boating and hiking in the Howe Sound/Squamish area all my life. It is a beautiful, pristine area within a 30-60 minute boatride of Vancouver. There is no other area like this anywhere in proximity to Vancouver. As the population of Vancouver grows, so too do the demands on nearby recreational areas. This is the case with the Howe Sound/Gambier Island area. Boating, hiking, kayaking, water skiing and fishing, to name a few, are recreations that are growing in popularity in this area so close to Vancouver. To permit a gravel pit to operate in this beautiful recreational area would be shortsighted and most unfortunate.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
614	166 - 1	Beverly Grantham	North Vancouver, BC	There are more than 400 families, well over a thousand people, who regularly use both Ekins and Thunderbird outstations and enjoy the pristine vistas and calming silence they provide only hours from the huge noisy metropolis of Vancouver. McNab Creek and its valley must be preserved to ensure this gem is intact for future generations.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
615	166 - 2	Beverly Grantham	North Vancouver, BC	To allow the destruction and ruin of Howe Sound, it's tourism, fishery, recreational enjoyment, marine and land animal habitats all for the sake of corporate greed and scant jobs is unconscionable and extremely short sighted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
616	166 - 3	Beverly Grantham	North Vancouver, BC		<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
617	166 - 4	Beverly Grantham	North Vancouver, BC	To allow the destruction and ruin of Howe Sound, it's tourism, fishery, recreational enjoyment, marine and land animal habitats all for the sake of corporate greed and scant jobs is unconscionable and extremely short sighted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
618	166 - 5	Beverly Grantham	North Vancouver, BC	To allow the destruction and ruin of Howe Sound, it's tourism, fishery, recreational enjoyment, marine and land animal habitats all for the sake of corporate greed and scant jobs is unconscionable and extremely short sighted.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
619	167 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is just coming back to life after being decimated by industry. It is finally cleaned up enough for fish, dolphins and whales to enjoy again and Burnco wants to destroy it. If they are allowed their greedy gravel operation, Howe Sound will be dead again into at least 2080....	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
620	168 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	On Sept. 14th I attended the public information session sponsored by Burnco and I felt sick to my stomach. It was set up like a science fair and they were giving out honey! It was such a joke! The Howe Sound is at risk of facing a serious environmental problem if Burnco is given the go ahead to put a proposed mine at McNab creek. I am pleading with you and all your powers at be to do whatever is necessary to shut this down as soon as possible.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
621	168 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	McNab creek flows into a productive estuary flourishing with marine life.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
622	168 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The valley has many species at risk that this mine threatens.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
623	168 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	We all know that the Departments of Fisheries and Oceans expressed strong concern about the project's impact to fish and fish habitat but seems to scared to fight the fight.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
624	168 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The Howe Sound has finally made a remarkable recovery after decades of industrial abuse and is finally being recognized by local recreational enthusiasts as a premier local destination.</p> <p>A day in this area is actually more spectacular than any of the more commercialized venues such as Grouse Mountain, Capilano Suspension Bridge or the Sea to Sky Gondola – why would you want to let this be destroyed!?!?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
625	168 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>It's only been within the past 20-30 years that this area has slowly been discovered by many passionate, highly educated and hard working recreationalist that have purchased land in this area. There are so many attractions in Howe Sound and one of them is its spectacular scenery and peacefulness. Surely there is more value in recreational land than a gravel mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
626	168 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Any industrial noise is sure to spoil this, especially the noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. I notice that there was no mention of rock crushing in their Burnco's report. Apparently, Burnco did a sound study but they put the noise sensor in a remote location which was no where close to the recreational cottages, yacht clubs, kids camps or residences at McNab Creek. They seem oblivious to the fact that sound travels over water! I also can't see how the baby salmon will tolerate the noise vibrations in the spanning channel which is so close to their operation.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
627	168 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>This area has so much more to offer than industrial insatiability. Please consider the value of this spectacular place so close to the city with so much peace, quiet and majestic beauty. We will fight hard to keep it that way. I hope we can count on your support too!</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
628	169 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
629	169 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone.</p> <p>Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
630	169 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
631	169 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life</li> <li>• Disruption to the elk, an at risk species</li> </ul>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
632	169 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
633	169 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compromised air quality due to emissions</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
634	169 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
635	169 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
636	169 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery. The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
637	170 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Ottawa, ON	<p>We should require that Burnco submit an environmental protection financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given.</p> <p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, I think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
638	171 - 1	Jackie Campbell	Pitt Meadows, BC	<p>This is a fantastic idea and should be the standard for all industry in sensitive habitat. The government no doubt scream this is an anti incentive for industry but I think it's time has come.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
639	172 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Healthy oceans and human wellbeing comes before ergonomic gain and industry.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
640	172 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Healthy oceans and human wellbeing comes before ergonomic gain and industry.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
641	172 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Healthy oceans and human wellbeing comes before ergonomic gain and industry.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
642	172 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	We make too many mistakes that are only realized in hindsight - this mine and the harm it can/will do is one of those mistakes. Please don't open the mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
643	137 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Please respect the environmental importance of Howe Sound and reject the Burnco proposal. We count on governments to protects its people and its natural resources. No respected scientist think this project is a good idea. Save Howe Sound!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
644	174 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am going to make this short because it's so obvious it's stupid! Howe Sound needs to be protected. It's one of the most beautiful places in the world. People come from all over the world just to drive along its shoreline. Why are you guys even entertaining the idea of more industry on it?  Please wake up and protect it now!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
645	175 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Salt Spring Island, BC	I feel that it is better to be prepared than to find a situation, at the end of a contract or other agreement, in which the person/company responsible for damages to an environmental area must be forced into some remediation work. Therefore, why not have the companies who wish to engage in dealing in an area that is environmentally sensitive, put up a bond that will cover any eventuality and not leave the tax-payers of BC on the hook for it.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
646	176 - 1	Chavah Avraham	Vancouver, BC	In light of past experience it is entirely reasonable that Burnco guarantee reclamation funds in advance of initiating their project. It would be nice if they could be trusted to exercise responsibility but such corporations have proved such trust to be unfounded.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
647	177 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	<p>I camp at Porteau Cove and ski at Whistler and have lived in Squamish. I watched Howe Sound go from Dead to Recovered over the past 40 years. Please don't let it get ruined yet again.</p> <p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
648	178 - 1	Helen May	Vancouver, BC	<p>Yes! Burnco must be held accountable for environmental assessment of the impact their mine has and will have on the salmon and surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
649	179 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>The Burnco aggregate mine — located between Gibsons and Squamish and proposed for McNab Creek, the second-largest salmon-bearing stream in the region, will be an environmental threat for the region and for BC.</p> <p>While some are raising concerns that the gravel and sand mine could damage fish habitat and fish, particularly chum and coho, others are hopeful that proposed end-of-project reclamation work will restore the environment.</p> <p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, we think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
650	180 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Companies mining in BC should have to pay for possible environmental damage before finalizing a permit not after the project is finished.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
651	181 - 1	Jessica Carson	Vancouver, BC	<p>The proponent, Burnco, should be required to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations before environmental approval is given. We need to know that they will be accountable for any environmental degradation caused by their mining operations.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
652	182 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Roberts Creek, BC	Probably a good idea to have Burnco post a fairly significant bond to insure environmental cleanup actually takes place.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
653	183 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Protecting Howe Sound, and protecting the nearby major salmon-bearing stream - those serious protections cost money. I'd hope for a very large 'protection' bond as surety for any damage (pollution, major disturbance of sand/gravel and overflow) to this environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
654	183 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Protecting Howe Sound, and protecting the nearby major salmon-bearing stream - those serious protections cost money. I'd hope for a very large 'protection' bond as surety for any damage (pollution, major disturbance of sand/gravel and overflow) to this environment.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
655	184 - 1	Alan Lewis	Vancouver, BC	Prepayment is required for many jobs -- prepayment for cleanup and revitalization of a sand & gravel operation area seems appropriate.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
656	185 - 1	Len Shaw	Surrey, BC	<p>I agree with Theresa Beer who wrote: "Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, we think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents." This should be adopted as standard for such projects. We taxpayers are unfairly paying the clean-up costs for corporations. I want my dollars used for protecting the environment, not salvaging toxic remnants from irresponsible industry.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
657	186 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
658	187 - 1	Christina Kosianic	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The Howe sound is a recovering ecosystem.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
659	187 - 2	Christina Kosianic	North Vancouver, BC	<p>A migratory route for salmon.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
660	187 - 3	Christina Kosiancic	North Vancouver, BC	Jeopardizing this natural resource for another mine that's pollutes the environment is STUPID & should be prevented. Think of the environmental cost not big corporate profits!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
661	188 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	Burnco must provide an up-front deposit to cover future restoration costs	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
662	189 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	New Westminster, BC	There should be no reason to not pay up front for environmental damage. If there is a plan for environmental reclamation then the money should be there anyway. It's should be pretty simple, especially with the environmental history with company's like Burnco and the current state of OUR environment.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
663	190 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	We cannot risk the 2nd largest salmon run. Don't allow this mine to go ahead. concerns The gravel and sand mine could damage fish habitat and fish, particularly chum and coho.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
664	191 - 1	Barry Cogswell	Vancouver, BC	<p>Over the past 200 years, but most markedly since the middle of the 20th Century, we have massively increased the wealth of humans by our resource extraction and industry. We have also dangerously increased the human population to unsustainable numbers. Now our belief in infinite growth is leading the planet and our contemporary civilization to collapse. The indications of that inevitable collapse are many and obvious. It is time we designed a new economic model that is intended for sustainable growth and lasting security. A first step, to finding a sustainable economic model, will be to leave as many resources in the ground as possible, especially those extraction projects with the probability of doing serious ecological harm. We must do this until we can see an intelligent way ahead. We will need a way that will neither destroy the planet's ecological integrity nor the security and future prospects of our descendants.</p> <p>For further Info see book: To Have Borne Witness by same author.</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
665	192 - 1	Adam Wray	West Vancouver, BC	<p>As a concerned resident of the Howe Sound region, I do not support this project. The ecosystems it will undoubtedly effect are intrinsically linked with thousands of others, and the ripple impact could be incredibly detrimental to the health of our region. For the sake of my generation and those to come, please consider these impacts and halt this project.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
666	193 - 1	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>I am writing today in response to Burnco application for a gravel pit at McNabb Creek estuary. As a long time resident of McNab Creek I must express my opposition to this project. I believe our Polite questions to Burnco were taken as cooperation. Contrary to what Burnco has suggested we are not in favour of a gravel pit. Reading through their application they have many of their fax incorrect. Too many to list, but I will touch base on a few.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
667	193 - 2	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>The land that our community sits on was purchased August 6, 1968. The sunshine coast regional district granted residential zoning for this area. One of the original developers can Townson is still a member of our community. In the early 70s he began bringing cabins up by barge from Richmond and developed our community. Cabins at that time were selling for \$180,000. Since Burnco's intentions were made public seven years ago, property values have dropped, and been stagnant. No one wants to invest across from an area where proposed gravel pit may be approved. While the rest of Vancouver and the lower mainland have experienced huge increases in their residential values hours continues to drop and be of no interest to people looking for recreational enjoyment.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
668	193 - 3	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>I would like to express what this community has meant to us. This community because of its remoteness and it's lack of power and services, has been a blessing in disguise's. Many of the residents have been at McNabb for many years we have spent our summers there each year, with our children, and now grandchildren. We enjoy a way of life there, without technology out of TVs, phones, and Electricity, that is hard to describe. It is a place where there is conversation at dinner, games to be played on the beach, fishing and hiking and swimming. Where we must help each other because there is no one else to call. We have become a community of very close neighbors. Our community and our way of life that we have cherished over the last 40 years is at risk of coming to an end.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
669	193 - 4	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	This proposed Burnco gravel pit will be 150 feet deep in the middle of one of the last estuaries, and the only beach in the Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
670	193 - 5	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	It will adversely affect thousands of people at the yacht clubs, kids camps and most directly our community.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
671	193 - 6	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	It is directly across the river from our residences (450 feet) and the noise levels they have proposed are unacceptable and unrealistic. There are huge discrepancies in their testing of predictive noise levels.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
672	193 - 7	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt. Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
673	193 - 8	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt. Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
674	193 - 9	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt. Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
675	193 - 10	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our community, and we use this remote and Pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation, love and respect of nature, for their children and all generations to come.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.
676	193 - 11	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	We at McNab Creek community have paid our taxes for 40 years towards schools, libraries, infrastructure, and services that we do not have in our area. We ask that you consider, our community, and our contribution over many years of taxes paid. We ask that you recognize how this directly contradicts the sunshine coast mission statement. We also ask that you do not turn a slow and struggling recovery of our beautiful Howe Sound back to the industrial past.  Sincerely [personal information withheld] 22 year resident of McNabb creek	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
677	194 - 1	C. Charles Rudd	Bowen Island, BC	No to any further Mining or Heavy Industry in Howe Sound and Region.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
678	195 - 1	Pat Gibbs	Maple Ridge, BC	Resource extraction companies have a terrible record of avoiding damage to the environment and a worse record of cleaning up the mess they made. Make sure they pay for cleanup (hundreds of millions of dollars) before they start to make their mess or taxpayers will be on the hook for the costs and that will make me very angry.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
679	196 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor. Howe Sound is the home to a great variety of mammals, fish, frogs, rare birds and invertebrates. It supports jobs in the local economy, especially tourism which has a significant ripple effect through the region's economy, and brings pleasure to thousands of locals and tourists every year.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
680	196 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	We all cherish and celebrate the recovery of Howe Sound after decades of toxic pollution from heavy industry. BC taxpayers paid millions to clean up the Britannia mine in Howe Sound and now finally those actions, along with other conservation efforts, are paying off with the return of fish stocks, dolphins, orcas, whales and a proliferation of bald eagles and other wildlife.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
681	196 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
682	196 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
683	196 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
684	196 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	We support the creation of a long term comprehensive land and water use plan for economic and social activities in the region that are compatible with sustainable uses of the Howe Sound.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
685	196 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	We ask you to stop this ill-advised project that will destroy a portion of this amazing natural resource, all for the sake of the short term profits of a mining company.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
686	197 - 1	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	BURNCO McNab Valley Aggregate Mine ... PLEASE STOP THIS TRAVESTY IN HOWE SOUND  As one of the 400+ families of Burrard Yacht Club that will be directly affected by this proposed project, my wife and I ask you to STOP THIS NOW. And we're asking you to act for more than us alone.  Here is why:	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
687	197 - 2	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>1. The project promises at best a few jobs and meager government revenues - so why despoil Howe Sound this way? ... and which precludes the other jobs and revenues related to the recreational and residential uses this area enjoys now and in future.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
688	197 - 3	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>2. Risks to commercial shipping - The 'new' Burnco tug+barge traffic will be added to all of the shipping congestion daily for 15 to 20 years! - both current and planned - and notably from the 'other' planned expansions of Port Metro Vancouver shipping. And there is lots of shipping traffic today, let alone in future when it will include the 'new' Burnco tug+barge traffic and significant planned 'new' LNG and oil tanker traffic. All of this shipping traffic has to 'transit' both our local 'metro' waters (and LNG terminals are planned for Howe Sound) as well as the entire southern Gulf of Georgia - which includes the challenges of shipping route 'convergence' at the mouth of the Fraser River - known as Sandheads with its very real and substantial hazards during tide changes against prevailing winds, especially during frequent winter storms - and the restricted 'passages' between the American San Juan Islands and the Canadian Gulf Islands.</p> <p>3. Risks to BC Ferries - All of Tug+barge traffic will 'cross' multiple BC Ferries routes daily for 15 to 20 years!</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
689	197 - 4	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>4. The ongoing desecration of the pristine McNab Valley, carried out over 15-20 years has significant societal costs that Burnco will not be paying. In other words, every other 'user' of Howe Sound will pay. NOT Burnco. The fish and flora and fauna will pay. NOT Burnco.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
690	197 - 5	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>5. In today's day and age, how is it possible to not recognize the obvious recreational, environmental, and social costs - the 'externalities' - that Burnco has ignored in its project submissions.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
691	197 - 6	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>6. Noise-pollution 24 x 7 x 365 x 15 to 20 years, and Burnco will NOT pay - and I do not for a moment believe the self-serving and absurd noise estimates provided by Burnco.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
692	197 - 7	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	7. Sight-pollution forever, and exactly the same as what is 'growing' now above the town-site of Gibsons (also on Howe Sound) and Sechelt (on the Sunshine Coast). Enough already.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
693	197 - 8	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	8. The unique recreational and environmental attributes of the McNab Valley, which happens to be a very easily accessible 36 km (22 mi) from downtown Vancouver, will be lost forever. And these competing uses by Metro Vancouver residents, tourists, and Howe Sound 'locals' alike, have been conveniently ignored by Burnco.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
694	197 - 9	Joseph Bowes	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Frankly, the very serious negative impacts of this project are an affront, today and forever into future, to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Every Metro Vancouver citizen and taxpayer,</li> <li>2. Any 'on-the-water' or 'back-country' tourist - local or 'from-away', hiker, kayaker, hunter, fisher, cruise boat passengers, etc, etc - who would 'rec-re-ate' in any way at all in Howe Sound,</li> <li>3. The very effective "Super Natural BC" marketing expense and branding efforts, dating back a decade or so now, and</li> <li>4. Every tourism-related job in this great Province.</li> </ol> <p>Please do not let the 'travesty' of the BURNCO McNab Valley Aggregate Mine progress any further.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
695	198 - 1	Shawn Groff	Vancouver, BC	The gravel and sand mine could damage fish habitat and fish, particularly chum and coho.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
696	198 - 2	Shawn Groff	Vancouver, BC	<p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
697	199 - 1	Angelika Hackett	Burnaby, BC	<p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, we think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
698	200 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	<p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, we think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
699	201 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>My concern is the Howe sound as I live on Bowen Island and swim in the ocean almost everyday in the summer. But truly more importantly value, honor, and respect the animals that live in the ocean. It is not ok that even a slight chance of disaster could affect them for our own selfish human interests.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
700	201 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	What is being done to 100% take away the risk of harm to their home? The Howe Sound?	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
701	202 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Barry's Bay, ON	Please consider the cost of an environmental disaster in allowing the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project to go ahead. The potential is there to destroy one of the most beautiful habitats in the world. At the very least, make this company setup a trust that would cover the costs of an environmental disaster, as the track record for companies to pay after the fact is very dismal. Such a policy should be in place for any potentially damaging projects, if they are deemed necessary.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
702	203 - 1	Terry Lawrence	Surrey, BC	Require Burnco to post a \$10 million cleanup bond before approving a permit.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
703	204 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Hereby, I write you my comments for the Application for an Environmental Assessment by the Burnco aggregate mine — located between Gibsons and Squamish and proposed for McNab Creek, the second-largest salmon-bearing stream in the region.</p> <p>I am very concerned that this project will damage the fish habitat and fish, particularly chum and coho salmon.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
704	204 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, I believe that Burnco should pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
705	205 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	My daughters are 4th generation Howe Sound residents. Their great grandfather and his sons rowed to their small cabin in Christie cove each weekend all the way from False creek. We have lived in Gibsons and have family on Bowen Island as well as a 60 year ownership in a co-op acreage on Bowyer Island.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
706	205 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is our back yard and was poisoned and dying from the blanket of wood waste covering its whole floor from Woodfiber mill out to beyond Gibsons. No shrimp or fish were flourishing due to this pollution. With the effort of our environmental steward the Sound is finally recovering and its fragile ecosystem must be protected.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
707	205 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There would be much more reward and many more jobs from eco tourism.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result in a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
708	205 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There would be much more reward and many more jobs from eco tourism.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
709	205 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Do not destroy that lovely valley and sound with the greed and disrespect evidenced from the other gravel projects in the area. No money can replace the beauty of this place.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
710	206 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver Island, BC	I support development of the Burnco aggregate project	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
711	207 - 1	Byron Bona	North Vancouver, BC	My Major concern is that the mine project is totally for the economic benefit of Burnco. All risk is taken by the people of BC while Burnco reaps the profits. We are asked to give Burnco a "non-renewable" resource, sand and gravel, and chance environment disruption. In return Burnco benefits by a reduction in transportation costs.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
712	208 - 1	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
713	208 - 2	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
714	208 - 3	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
715	208 - 4	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <p>a) visual impact;</p> <p>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</p> <p>c) artificial lighting;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
716	208 - 5	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <p>a) visual impact;</p> <p>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</p> <p>c) artificial lighting;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
717	208 - 6	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) visual impact;</li> <li>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</li> <li>c) artificial lighting;</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
718	208 - 7	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>3) Local impact on the recreational property owners in McNab Creek and along Gambier Island, particularly the north and east coastlines.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
719	208 - 8	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The argument that there will be minimal environmental impact because the land has historically been used for logging and forestry is inadequate. Howe Sound is just starting to recover from those years of heavy logging, mining, and industrial use. While Howe Sound will always remain a mixed use body of water, I do not think we truly understand the cumulative impact of increasing industrial activity in the area. Given the proximity to the Lower Mainland, the potential to expand tourism and recreational use of Howe Sound is immense. Disturbing and damaging the shoreline reduces that potential, possibly permanently.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
720	208 - 9	Andrea Townson	Howe Sound, BC	I understand that the Sunshine Coast needs a diverse and sustainable economy. However, in this particular situation, I think that the environmental concerns outweigh any possible economic benefit.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
721	209 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Langley, BC	<p>Given the history of polluting companies that have walked away from paying for environmental damage, we think the onus should be on Burnco to pay up front for possible environmental damage from their operations. They should be required to submit a financial bond (in the tens of millions of dollars range) before environmental approval is given. This will safeguard communities and cover costs for environmental protection, site reclamation and damages from accidents.</p> <p>We need to learn from past mistakes. Nurturing Howe Sound's marine recovery means making polluters pay — before they set up shop near communities</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
722	210 - 1	Graham Ross	Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco proposal.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
723	210 - 2	Graham Ross	Vancouver, BC	I believe the environmental assessment is inadequate. Howe Sound has seen a huge increase in wildlife in the past decade, from orcas and porpoises to sardines, which will be threatened by this kind of development.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
724	210 - 3	Graham Ross	Vancouver, BC	The basic premise of the environmental assessment is that since the area was used for logging and forestry in the past, there will be not significant impact on the environment. This argument completely ignores the recovery that has occurred in Howe Sound.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
725	210 - 4	Graham Ross	Vancouver, BC	The minimal proposed economic benefit of the gravel pit does not justify the risk to the environment and the growing tourism industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
726	211 - 1	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
727	211 - 2	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
728	211 - 3	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>I have the following concerns on the impact of the mine:</p> <p>1) Environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife including</p> <p>a) disturbance and destruction of habitat, including upstream and foreshore;</p> <p>b) impact of light and noise;</p> <p>c) changes in fresh and tidal water quality due to sediment and prop wash and increased wave activity;</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
729	211 - 4	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <p>a) visual impact;</p> <p>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</p> <p>c) artificial lighting;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
730	211 - 5	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <p>a) visual impact;</p> <p>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</p> <p>c) artificial lighting;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
731	211 - 6	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>2) Recreation/tourism impact on paddlers exploring the Sea to Sky Marine trail, recreational fishermen, and recreational boaters as a result of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) visual impact;</li> <li>b) noise; (beyond the immediate underwater pit area, it will be hard to mitigate noise along the waterfront and across the water);</li> <li>c) artificial lighting;</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
732	211 - 7	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>3) Local impact on the recreational property owners in McNab Creek and along Gambier Island, particularly the north and east coastlines.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
733	211 - 8	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>The argument that there will be minimal environmental impact because the land has historically been used for logging and forestry is inadequate. Howe Sound is just starting to recover from those years of heavy logging, mining, and industrial use. While Howe Sound will always remain a mixed use body of water, I do not think we truly understand the cumulative impact of increasing industrial activity in the area. Given the proximity to the Lower Mainland, the potential to expand tourism and recreational use of Howe Sound is immense. Disturbing and damaging the shoreline reduces that potential, possibly permanently.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
734	211 - 9	Bruce Townson	Williamsons Landing, BC	I understand that the Sunshine Coast needs a diverse and sustainable economy. However, in this particular situation, I think that the environmental concerns outweigh any possible economic benefit.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
735	212 - 1	Sheila Pratt	Maple Ridge, BC	I am not an expert. I will not receive payment for making my comments, unlike the lobbyists who stand to gain financially. I would just like to see our environment be given priority over the economy. After all, the economy is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the environment.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
736	212 - 2	Sheila Pratt	Maple Ridge, BC	I understand the world-wide need for sand and gravel, however, considering the many companies that have "accidentally" or otherwise polluted our environment (and negatively affected the health of people as well as other living things), and then either walked away from the damage or denied responsibility for it, I hope Burnco will be required to pay up front for possible damage from their operations. The sum should be a meaningful sum, one that reflects the worst possible damage. Howe Sound will not continue its recovery unless those who might accidentally, or just carelessly, pollute cover the costs before hand. Hopefully prepayment will encourage them to not pollute.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
737	213 - 1	Carl Halvorson	Brackendale, BC	I would like to voice my opposition to this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
738	213 - 2	Carl Halvorson	Brackendale, BC	<p>After only 16 years of minimum employment what will be the legacy of this project - a large effectively "dead" lake, devoid of any significant ecological value compared to the existing land - a working forest, with all its values will be removed from the ecosystem. Regardless of your views on forestry, forests in transition from logged through succession to mature forest have enormous value as terrestrial habitats - a mine's tailing pond loses these values forever.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
739	213 - 3	Carl Halvorson	Brackendale, BC	<p>To create this lake, and supposedly ensure the continued viability of McNab Creek, two dams will have to be constructed and maintain in perpetuity. Who will do this after the 16 years of gravel extraction takes place? The upper dam (berm) ensures that McNab Creek will not leave its current course and do as all rivers do, meander across its floodplain. Failure of this upper berm (dike) would mean the total loss of the lower reaches of McNab Creek and probable failure of the lower dike as well. This lower dike is intended to raise the water elevation in the proposed lake high enough to ensure McNab is not dewatered by groundwater loss in the underlying aquifer. How exactly is this ensured? Will there be long term monitoring of McNab Creek above the lake to ensure there is no leaching of groundwater from the creek? Who will pay for this long term monitoring and if it is done, how will the proponent be held responsible or mitigate for any damage? In the worst case scenario, if this scheme does not work, the lower reaches of the creek dry up and fish cannot enter the system at all - it's dead for fish except for those windows when there is enough rainfall and runoff to wet the creek to its mouth.</p>	<p>The McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke and the Pit Lake Containment Berm will meet the required design standards to be confirmed with the Ministry of Energy and Mines at permitting. It is BURNCO's understanding that the these structures will not be classified as dams. As the property owner, BURNCO will be responsible for required maintenance of these structures, post-operations.</p> <p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
740	213 - 4	Carl Halvorson	Brackendale, BC	<p>If our governing agencies, in their wisdom, give approval to this project, there must be significant assurances that McNab Creek will never lose flow through changes (loss) to underlying aquifers. There must be assurances with dollars and financial repercussions that effective long term monitoring will be done. There must be assurances that those same requirements are put in place for both dikes being created. There must be long term monitoring and responsibility to ensure viability of any habitats (replacement spawning channels) created as compensation for habitat loss, and there must be some kind of "value added" component in the proposed lake. If it "must" be done then there must be significantly more compensation for the loss of terrestrial habitats and alluvial fan features. If it is built why not require construction of wetland habitat margins of significant width on all borders of the lake - say 100 meters wide. The proposal does not include any habitat margin or transition. With shallow slopes into the lake and 100 meters of wetland on all margins there is at least some possible benefit - wouldn't it be nice to create wetlands - rather than fill them as we do for port, road or housing development?</p> <p>The project is flawed, it will require long term monitoring and maintenance - who will do this when the gravel is gone?</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
741	213 - 5	Carl Halvorson	Brackendale, BC	<p>The gravel extraction proposed will be removing one of the most precious resources in our area, clean alluvial gravels suitable for salmonid spawning habitats. In its current form, McNab Creek can meander across its floodplain, and wherever it goes through that process there will be good clean gravel for eggs to be deposited, mature and hatch in. There is that potential here for the ages to come. If this proposal goes through though it is likely the gravel industry's eyes will reach for the next "McNab Creek" to recreate this project and another important alluvial fan with its working successional forest will be converted into a tailing pond.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
742	214 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	1. The construction phase: This application and the public presentation did not offer an adequate understanding of the duration of the construction phase, nor the maintenance phase. The construction phase is estimated to be from 4 months to 2 years and as the project is expanded will there be more than the initial construction phase?	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.
743	214 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	I found that the proponent does not appear to adequately reconcile noise, vessel wake assessment during the construction phase with peak recreational periods such as May to October.	Measures for mitigating potential noise effects are presented in Table 18-1 of the EAC Application/EIS. A Noise Management Plan will be developed, which will include a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.
744	214 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	The maintenance period is indicated as 16 years. AT the end of this period, does the BCEAO have any mechanism to force the proponent to complete this project? does this mechanism have any teeth?	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.  Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.
745	214 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	2. BURNCO's public presentation indicated that > 100 jobs would be required during the construction phase: this number of personnel would require > 2 water taxi trips (return) per day and their associated wakes. The foreshore and the docks, safety of small vessels (kayakers, camp children in canoes, paddle-boarders, small fishing dingys, et) will be adversely affected by this greatly increased traffic. Local knowledge of the area over-rides the proponent's estimation that wakes will not adversely affect these areas or recreation vessels. As a local recreational user with decades of local knowledge and experience, I know this to be untrue, as do all of the dock owners along the north and east shores of Gambier Island.	Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.  There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.  Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.  Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
746	214 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	2. BURNCO's public presentation indicated that > 100 jobs would be required during the construction phase: this number of personnel would require > 2 water taxi trips (return) per day and their associated wakes. The foreshore and the docks, safety of small vessels (kayakers, camp children in canoes, paddle-boarders, small fishing dingys, et) will be adversely affected by this greatly increased traffic. Local knowledge of the area over-rides the proponent's estimation that wakes will not adversely affect these areas or recreation vessels. As a local recreational user with decades of local knowledge and experience, I know this to be untrue, as do all of the dock owners along the north and east shores of Gambier Island.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential changes in water, sediment and habitat quality from in-water works and propellor scour, and potential injury/mortality from in-water works, propellor scour and vessel strikes. Measures for mitigating potential effects from marine traffic on marine resources are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of potential residual effects on marine resources were determined to be negligible or not significant.
747	215 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	After attending one of the information sessions on the proposed Burnco Aggregate Mine Project and mulling over the abundant information presented I think that it is a fairly easy conclusion to make that in no way would we welcome this project to the jewel that we call Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
748	215 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	One area that came to light in the presentation is that there will be minimal environmental impact because the land has been used in the past for logging. Really! This is such backwards thinking for 2016 and the future that we want for Howe Sound. We have seen first hand with the clean-up of the Britannia Copper Mine that we can reverse the environmental damage that we once created. The Howe Sound Marine Trail is proof that we can create a different future and story for our beloved Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area. BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
749	215 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	Economically we do need jobs in the SLRD region but are we willing to trade such a beautiful area for 12 jobs?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
750	216 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	<p>In Table 7.3-9 of the Burcno Aggregate Application : both for the construction and operations phase, Burnco indicates that existing logging boom tenure traffic will be similar to water taxis and barges and tug traffic that will bring both personal and equipment to the site. This is inaccurate to suggest that recreational traffic are somehow 'educated and experienced' due to having had prior experience with log boom-related (typically very slow) water transportation. Is it not expected that water taxis will be tasked with transporting employees/workers in as efficient manner as possible? in the least amount of time? If so, local recreational boaters can expect high-speed water taxis and high-speed tugs with the ensuing high wakes to affect recreational traffic through this area. Children's camp canoes, all kayakers, all wake-boarders and paddle-boarders, small fishing dingys and swimmers should expect to be swamped by these commercial vessels. It is unrealistic and unsafe that BURNCO expects that these groups will have had experience with commercial water traffic and be aware of the federal DOT COLLISION REGULATIONS. There can be no 'mitigation' of the risk for safety in this widely-used area during the summer months. Burnco's Marine Transportation Plan does not adequately address that these users will not have VHF radios nor be reading Notices to Mariners.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
751	217 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Flood hazards in the McNab Valley</p> <p>At the public information session I heard an explanation of how stream water would be held back from overflowing into the pit by the preventative berms. I live in Howe Sound and there have been many extreme rain and wind events in the past where erosion has caused landslides and debris flooding. There is an aerial video of the McNab Creek and project area from 1997 that shows a landslide on the bank of McNab Creek at the top east side of the project area. The landslide brought many large trees into the creek and there is evidence they were carried downstream as seen in the video. It seems logical to me that all development in the Howe Sound watershed should be using similar predictions for extreme rainfall due to climate change. Page 5-4-28/29 is confusing to me as it seems that because Golder has no evidence of significant debris flows and floods and conclude no further investigation is needed. It also says further investigation should be done to ensure engineering is adequate. Would the bank erosion evident in the 1997 video not be considered significant and how is it determined this could not happen again given the ongoing logging in the area? How can this environmental assessment determine any significant environment harm without these studies being complete? When I asked the Geotech consultant if the most up to date flood predictions were used in the design of the preventative berms, he referred me to the Surface Water consultant. I asked the consultant who had "Climate Change" on her badge and she could not answer the question. The Surface Water consultant suggested I submit my comments recommending the most up to date flood predictions based on</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there is a conflict in the cited text. The lack of evidence for significant, historical debris floods or debris flows in McNab Creek both upstream and downstream of the Project Area indicate that the risk of impacts to the Project Area can be considered low. Proposed geotechnical and natural hazards mitigation, which includes construction of the flood protection dyke, will further reduce the potential for impacts to the Project Area.</p>
752	218 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>During the September 14th public information session, Dr. Jeff Marliave of the Vancouver Aquarium brought to the Marine Resources consultant's attention the latest data regarding cloud sponge reefs and other information relevant to the project. Dr. Marliave and the Howe Sound research group have been studying Howe Sound over the past 30 years. It was not evident the Golder Consultants had the requested the latest information from the Vancouver Aquarium. Dr. Marliave said he would send the data to the consultant but will that information be reflected in the assessment? There were concerns about the alternative shipping route and its proximity to important cloud sponge reefs en route.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
753	219 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	<p>Section 2.2 of the Burnco EA application fails to convince me that the lower mainland cannot meet the growing need for gravel. I cannot find any evidence that existing supplies in the lower mainland will diminish in the future or that no new sources will be found in other areas. Burnco also appears to justify the McNab Creek site by informing us that THEIR shipping costs will be reduced (for gravel transport that they already ship from Port MacNeil, Jervis Inlet, and Sechelt). That the proponent wishes to reduce their costs does not adequately overcome the future and certain losses to be placed on the local community/recreational users: property values, recreational opportunities (both personal and business). The environmental loss is not justified. How does one measure the pride that our community derives from Howe Sound? This project offers no benefit or advantage to Howe Sound and significantly reduces the immediate and long-term quality of life in the area. This project is devoted to the singular profit of the proponent and no one else. McNab Creek is the worst choice for resuming industry in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
754	220 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Health Impacts</p> <p>I was asked at the public information session in West Vancouver by BURNCO's Project Manager why I care how and when the BURNCO mine operates when I can't hear or see it. I have frequented Thornborough Channel over the past many years with friends and family. We and many others refer to the area as the Aloha Channel. Due to the topography it is one of our favorite areas in Howe Sound for enjoying the warm sun and water for swimming. We visit year round as it is close to home and instantly relaxing. My daughters and their friends care very much for this area. A trip to Aloha Channel is always a birthday wish.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
755	220 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	When people go to quiet places close to nature they derive valuable health benefits. These health benefits are not considered a “value component” in this EA process and should be. There are numerous studies on the benefits of natural sounds on mood behavior. By a simple search on-line it is possible to find studies conducted out of universities that support the fact natural scenes and natural sounds can be beneficial to health by reducing stress. Thousands of people testify they visit this part of Howe Sound for the peace and to be close to nature. Howe Sound, one of Canada’s southernmost fjords, is close to large urban centre and within one hour from busy Vancouver people can be in this peaceful part of Howe Sound.	A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
756	220 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The rationalization Golder Consultants make about logging activity being a baseline that then justifies the noise of gravel extraction, crushing and barge loading is like comparing apples to berries. The noise from this gravel operation is being introduced to what is now a peaceful area as logging activity is intermittent. The consultant evaluating noise impacts has never been to the project area. He seemed to not take into account the geography of the mountains on either side of this project and how sound reverberates off these mountains. Those who live in Howe Sound can easily testify how far sounds travel across the water. To benchmark the acceptable noise levels against Health Canada’s acceptable health standards is not relevant to what is acceptable in a peaceful area and the impact on mental health. Ambient sounds of nature cannot be compared to the sounds of artificial industrial noise. As Metro Vancouver continues to grow, protecting these quiet places close to the urban area is of great intrinsic value, far greater than short term revenues and twelve direct permanent jobs.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  The SCR D noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
757	221 - 1	Betty Morton	Bowen Island, BC	I strongly oppose the Bunco McNab Creek proposal for the harm it will do to our environment, community and economy.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
758	222 - 1	Beverley	Grantham, BC	The unbearable noise created by an aggregate mining, crushing and loading operation running 24/7 will drive away marine mammals that currently frequent Howe Sound. It is a well documented scientific fact that removing apex predators from an eco system results in dangerous imbalances that can cause extinctions of other species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
759	222 - 2	Beverley	Grantham, BC	The unbearable noise created by an aggregate mining, crushing and loading operation running 24/7 will drive away marine mammals that currently frequent Howe Sound. It is a well documented scientific fact that removing apex predators from an eco system results in dangerous imbalances that can cause extinctions of other species.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
760	222 - 3	Beverley	Grantham, BC	The unbearable noise created by an aggregate mining, crushing and loading operation running 24/7 will drive away marine mammals that currently frequent Howe Sound. It is a well documented scientific fact that removing apex predators from an eco system results in dangerous imbalances that can cause extinctions of other species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
761	222 - 4	Beverley	Grantham, BC	Say NO to Burnco!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
762	223 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Comments on studies regarding Socio-economic and land-use. It was determined the Local Study Area would extend out into Thornborough Channel 1.5 kms. The Local Study Area for noise should include the residents and outstations directly across from the project area on Gambier Island particularly since these affected stakeholders have been very vocal about this project from the onset. Sound travels much farther across the water, particularly when noise is reverberating off the mountains. Because this area is so quiet, many can testify that voices can be heard from people on boats near McNab by people on Gambier across the water.	The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.
763	223 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	In the section on Non-Traditional Land Use it appears some of the problem with the assessment is the data sourced from the Province of B.C. on Recreational Features Inventory figure 7.3-8 is misleading and not representative of the high sensitivity by recreational users. The homes on the north side of Gambier directly across from this project, the yacht club outstations and waters inbetween "unspecified". This data is certainly not accurate however, if the proponent and consultants had read the comments during the draft application, this discrepancy would be corrected. The other omission from this map is any designation of the recreation value of the waters of Howe Sound.	The homes on the north side of Gambier directly across from this project, the yacht club outstations and waters in between were considered as part of the assessment, particularly in relation to potential nuisance effects and marine transportation. Recreational areas, and recreational fishing areas in particular, are presented in Figures 7.3-6 and 7.3-7.
764	223 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The noise rating of 53 decibels that will be heard by the property owners at McNab Strata and close to McNab Creek is unacceptable. If buildings require walls with sound ratings for this decibel level so neighbors cannot hear the noise, then BURNCO should be required to construct walls to prevent this noise.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
765	223 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The socio-economic studies omit key social values of Howe Sound, especially for youth. Interviews with "Key informants" omitted interviews with any of the camp operators who have brought at least 3,000 youth to this area every year for decades. No interviews were conducted with the Boys and Girls Club of South coast BC. Same can be said for realtors in the area, specifically Rick Gustafson who has specialized in sales on Gambier Island for many years.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation effects - including youth camps - are considered in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
766	223 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Tourism data is minimal: Over the past few years Howe Sound has seen the regular return of Orcas and Grey Whales to this area and Orcas have been captured on film in front of McNab Creek. This has attracted new tour operators, including Prince of Whales Whale watching tours. Cruise ships travel past McNab Creek enroute north. Measures of Tourism should not be based on commercial operations only as this would imply that Gambier Island does not have "tourism". Recreation property owners on Gambier Island bring visitors to the island and there are many trail runners, hiking groups, school and educational groups that travel to Gambier by water taxi, the scheduled Stormaway water taxi or come by private boat or kayak. Hikes to Gambier Lake and Mount Artaban are accessed via the Halkett Bay Provincial Marine Park. None of this has been captured in this context statement the project location.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
767	223 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The assessment states phone-based interviews were conducted with "key informants" but the list of references indicates few personal phone calls and does not list who was interviewed. Owners of the Douglas Bay Development were no contacted by phone or email to understand why they have strong opposition to this project due to their proximity across the water.	Phone based interviews are cited as personal communications (pers.comm.) within the text of the EAC Application/EIS and details included in the references (Part G, Section 21). The list of key informants included the following: Burrard Yacht Club, Coastal Inlet Adventures, District of Squamish, Don's Water Taxi, Gambier Island Local Trust, Gibsons and District Chamber of Commerce, Gibsons Landing Inn, Irwin Motel, Islands Trust, McNab Creek Strata, Sewell's Marina, Squamish Yacht Club, Sunshine Kayaking, Thunderbird Yacht Club, Recreation Sites and Trails BC and West Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services.
768	223 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	There was no interview with Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, referenced as the oldest pulp and paper mill on the coast and oldest industry in Howe Sound. This mill is not far from the project area and there is significant history between this company, DFO and the artificial spawning channel BURNCO is proposing to remove. The attached contract between HSLP and DFO explains that relationship. In order to understand the context of this land use, reference to this history of this spawning channel provide more context to the Resource Use.	There was no interview with Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, however their history with the site and within Howe Sound is well documented. The history of the constructed groundwater-fed watercourse on the Property is presented in Section 2.4.2.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.
769	223 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Lions Gate Consulting published a Socio-Economic baseline of Howe Sound in May 2016. Golder refers to the Lions Bay Consulting report for Howe Sound produced in 2013. This report covered only a portion of Howe Sound in 2013 so is not representative of the entire region. Since this assessment is for a project that in the future, what updates to the assumptions in this EA are relevant in the new report that studies the whole of Howe Sound and the RSA?	The study area for the May 2013 report entitled 'Socio-Economic Baseline of the Howe Sound Area' was identified as "The Local Study Area (LSA) includes the municipalities of Bowen Island and Lions Bay, Gambier and Anvil islands and crown land in the vicinity of McNabb Creek on the north shore of Howe Sound". This study area is in the general vicinity of the proposed BURNCO project, and as such this report was accessed and reviewed for the environmental assessment of the BURNCO project, along with several other regionally relevant documents. In addition, several interviews were undertaken to help document 'existing conditions' or a baseline of various commercial, recreational, residential, industrial uses of lands and resources in the general vicinity of the BURNCO Project area, including the waters of Howe Sound.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
770	223 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	I strongly disagree with the conclusion in the environmental assessment: "The residual adverse effects are considered to be not-significant however as there are established forest industry activities in the area, recreational and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced from the LSA and the effect is expected to be limited to the medium-term (i.e., the life of the Project). " The current ongoing forestry activities are not a rationalization for a 16 year mining operation that brings constant significant noise and permanently removes the forest which is renewable. The residual effects of this project will have significant social and economic impacts on the current users of the area and be a deterrent for future recreational and tourism potential in the area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
771	224 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco development in Howe Sound. See my concerns and questions in the attached document. [attachment unavailable]	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
772	225 - 1	Dean Johnston	Gambier Island, BC	Don't destroy the beauty of this place.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
773	225 - 2	Dean Johnston	Gambier Island, BC	It is a draw for tourists and locals alike.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
774	225 - 3	Dean Johnston	Gambier Island, BC	We see whales, porpoises, sea lions and eagles frequently. My children deserve to enjoy this beautiful part of Howe Sound too!	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity or quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
775	225 - 4	Dean Johnston	Gambier Island, BC	We see whales, porpoises, sea lions and eagles frequently. My children deserve to enjoy this beautiful part of Howe Sound too!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
776	226 - 1	Robert Worcester	Vancouver, BC	This must not happen!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
777	226 - 2	Robert Worcester	Vancouver, BC	This area should be slated for a national park. It is one of the beautiful areas of BC and the world.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
778	227 - 1	Mr. Lovett	Surrey, BC	The Burnco project is a bad idea. It is unnecessary for BC and is a very bad fit in the area that they've proposed. Please deny this application.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
779	228 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<p>As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project. McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone.</p> <p>Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
780	228 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
781	228 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life</li> </ul>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
782	228 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption to the elk, an at risk species</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
783	228 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
784	228 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compromised air quality due to emissions</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
785	228 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
786	228 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
787	228 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
788	228 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
789	229 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I am NOT in favour of Burnco's proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek where fragile ecosystems will be destroyed. The recovery of Howe Sound is at stake, and the environment should not be sold to profit a few shareholders. For generations to come, we need to protect this area. No project approval!!! We can't undestroy the area when Burnco goes broke or walks away after the damage is done...	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
790	230 - 1	Richard H. O'Neill	Roberts Creek, BC	Howe Sound is just beginning to recover from the disastrous effects of previous industrial development. As a part of the Salish Sea the entire Howe Sound area should be allowed to return to its former natural state and become habitat for many species of fish and marine mammals. It will have far greater value as a clean natural habitat area than it will ever have from short term industrial projects.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
791	230 - 2	Richard H. O'Neill	Roberts Creek, BC	Howe Sound is just beginning to recover from the disastrous effects of previous industrial development. As a part of the Salish Sea the entire Howe Sound area should be allowed to return to its former natural state and become habitat for many species of fish and marine mammals. It will have far greater value as a clean natural habitat area than it will ever have from short term industrial projects.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
792	231 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	I fail to understand the merits of trading a project of high risk to our fragile ecosystem in exchange for 12 low-skill jobs. It just doesn't make sense.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
793	231 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	I strongly oppose this proposal for the harm it will do to our environment, community and economy. The Burnco project will irreversibly harm important wildlife, riparian and ocean habitat.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
794	231 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Howe Sound is only recently recovering from decades of environmental degradation from the mining industry. British Columbians are celebrating the tentative return of spawning herring and salmon along with crabs, prawns, dolphins and whales.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
795	231 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Howe Sound is only recently recovering from decades of environmental degradation from the mining industry. British Columbians are celebrating the tentative return of spawning herring and salmon along with crabs, prawns, dolphins and whales.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
796	231 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Howe Sound is only recently recovering from decades of environmental degradation from the mining industry. British Columbians are celebrating the tentative return of spawning herring and salmon along with crabs, prawns, dolphins and whales.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
797	231 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) has repeatedly opposed the project as it is so critical to the ecosystems. Please respect the findings of our Ministry scientists by rejecting this project.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
798	231 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Since Burnco itself acknowledges that this project will destroy the estuary and damage the Howe Sound ecosystem, why proceed? For such little return?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
799	231 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	The 12 low-skill jobs promised by Burnco will come at the cost of more sustainable industries including fisheries, recreation, film and tourism from which dollars are currently flowing into Howe Sound communities.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
800	231 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Burnco is a bad deal for Howe Sound, a bad deal for the surrounding communities, and a bad deal for British Columbia.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
801	232 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
802	232 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
803	232 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
804	232 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Environmental Concerns: - Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
805	232 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
806	232 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Disruption to the elk, an at risk species	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
807	232 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
808	232 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Compromised air quality due to emissions	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
809	232 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project’s barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
810	232 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	- Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
811	232 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery. The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
812	232 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Howe Sound is one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor. Howe Sound is the home to a great variety of mammals, fish, frogs, rare birds and invertebrates. It supports jobs in the local economy, especially tourism which has a significant ripple effect through the region's economy, and brings pleasure to thousands of locals and tourists every year.  We all cherish and celebrate the recovery of Howe Sound after decades of toxic pollution from heavy industry. BC taxpayers paid millions to clean up the Britannia mine in Howe Sound and now finally those actions, along with other conservation efforts, are paying off with the return of fish stocks, dolphins, orcas, whales and a proliferation of bald eagles and other wildlife.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area. BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
813	232 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
814	232 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	We support the creation of a long term comprehensive land and water use plan for economic and social activities in the region that are compatible with sustainable uses of the Howe Sound.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
815	232 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	We ask you to stop this ill-advised project that will destroy a portion of this amazing natural resource, all for the sake of the short term profits of a mining company.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
816	233 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I STRONGLY OPPOSE!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
817	233 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Burnco claims to keep environment and scenery untouched, but when you remove non-renewable resources the list of negative effects goes on to permanently destroy the land, water, ocean, wildlife, air quality and the thousands of people that come here to enjoy the natural beauty of British Columbia. Especially Howe sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
818	233 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	To all those people who support industry, your only supporting 12 jobs. 12! For only 20 years!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
819	233 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Need aggregates for construction? Use the local company in Squamish! Coast aggregates! Burnco already has 3 locations in bc and many more in Alberta and Saskatchewan.	A further source of aggregate material is required to ensure the reliability of supply. Securing alternate suppliers is not the preferred long-term option for BURNCO as there is too much uncertainty surrounding the ability to supply aggregate material during times of increased demand, in addition to the in ability to control the quality and price of material.
820	233 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	This place is too beautiful to ruin it with a mine. There are only so many untouched places to enjoy with your family and friends. Where do you plan on building your dream cabin?! Or taking sunset rides on the boat with your husband? There are A MILLION other places to extract gravel. Don't make mcnab creek one of them. Industry is not everything and with Squamish finally on the map, let's keep this place beautiful and pristine. We paid our environmental price in industry with britannia beach, nexen, logging.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
821	233 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Now it's time for tourism and Eco tourism. BURNCO GTFO	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
822	234 - 1	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	It is a undisputed fact the Howe Sound now has more wildlife in its waters and valleys then it has had in 20 years, as a result of the large rehabilitation projects from the federal and Provencal governments. projects such as Britannia creek rehabilitation and environmental Port Mellon Mill upgrades and projects, has had untold benefits for wildlife. Herring are back , which brought porpoise, and Orca's are inhabiting the Howe sound again. This is new and is seen by all ages, it can't be missed by Department of Fisheries.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
823	234 - 2	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Years earlier a similar gravel mine project was turned down by Department of Fisheries and oceans and the only thing that has changed since that project being denied is more wildlife numbers as a result from government rehabilitation projects.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
824	234 - 3	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	So with all the taxpayer rehabilitation projects over the years in the Howe sound and with all the benefits, is it viable to approve a project as environmentally disruptive as this?	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
825	234 - 4	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Will the added tax revenue benefit from Burnco cover the compromised rehabilitation projects from decades past?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
826	235 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco Gravel Pit at McNab Creek. When I can see the flock of cranes fly in, circle around and land on the beach to wait patiently for a fish to swim by. When I can watch eagles fly by ,almost at eye level, and watch them hunt. When I can watch a bear enter the estuary and munch on the grass there. When I can see a herd of Elk venture out on to the estuary and then wade around in the water. It is all awesome! When the gravel pit comes in this will all change. Change, not for the better.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
827	235 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I think about the sea life that will endure the disruptions of there home.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
828	235 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I think about the animals that forge for food on the sand beach not understanding the noise and vibrations they feel. I think about the animals in the nearby forest who dont understand what has happened to their homes.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
829	235 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	A gravel pit this close to an estuary is definately not a good idea.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
830	235 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The lake that Burnco will leave when the mining process is over.What chemicals will lurk in the bottom of the lake. A lake wasnt there before they came and it shouldnt be there when they leave.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
831	235 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is a beautiful area. Please dont allow Burnco to mine there. I'm sure gravel can be found elsewhere	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
832	236 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	This project does not belong in Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
833	236 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	It will damage the estuary, marine life, the pristine nature of the Sound, and tourism will suffer.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
834	236 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	It will damage the estuary, marine life, the pristine nature of the Sound, and tourism will suffer.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
835	237 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	A mine does not belong in a pristine Estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
836	238 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Stop the industrialization of Howe Sound. Allow the ecosystem to remain intact. Do not allow the project to process.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
837	239 - 1	Frank Mogridge	North Vancouver, BC	I am a pleasure boater using this area and am very concerned with the environmental impacts of a project of this magnitude. It is hard to believe approval may be given for Burncos proposal I attended a information session where Burncos representatives/scientists were defending their take on impacts of this project and providing limited mitigation to some of the publics concerns.	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
838	239 - 2	Frank Mogridge	North Vancouver, BC	The noise study in my opinion did not take into account and represent the activites and noise that this will generate in the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
839	239 - 3	Frank Mogridge	North Vancouver, BC	What limitations will be placed on them, if approved for hours of operation??	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
840	239 - 4	Frank Mogridge	North Vancouver, BC	For what appears to be jobs for 12 people versus the impact to the environment in this area for generations to come where is the value for the public of such approvals being granted ...this is hard to comprehend.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
841	239 - 5	Frank Mogridge	North Vancouver, BC	There will be visual impacts to this presently beautiful area the scar left on the mountainside and the environmentally dead water lake left behind will be a lasting clear message of the mistake made if these approvals are granted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
842	240 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	We are two Lower Mainland based sea kayakers who have visited this area many times, including working on the recently created Sea to Sky Marine Trail. This (and just about any further) industrial development in Howe Sd is unwelcome, as the area starts to recover from a devastating century of heavy resource exploitation that showed only disrespect for this wonderful fiord.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
843	240 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	However, we can see that the company has gone to some lengths to minimize negative impacts. Their environmental consultants provided good information at the recent open house.	Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.  Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.  Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are: - Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures - Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering - Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat - Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals. - Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.  Examples of compensation or offset measure are: - Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2. - Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.
844	240 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	Daytime noise seems to be the chief concern while the pit is operating. Further acoustic measures should be explored for the barge loading process.	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
845	240 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	Rehabilitation of the landscape post exhaustion of the pit must include measures to prevent any possible breach of the creek into the artificial lake or pond. All pilings, equipment and buildings must be removed sensitively. We strongly believe and urge that the developer be required to leave a positive local legacy by creating a marine-access-only campsite for very small boats above the fine beach behind the former loader location. This would complement other existing sites in Howe Sd which are already getting significant use in this growing recreation area. 16 or 20 years from now, no doubt all other nearby sites will be at maximum usage capacity. No dock would be required or wanted, but toilets would be very desirable. Presumably the pit will have earlier built sanitary facilities for its workers and possibly these could be adapted and permitted to remain for a further lifespan, if still working well. The site has shelter, more than adequate fresh water and the tree screen would mean little or no visual evidence of a campsite would be detectable from afar.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. A marine-access campsite is not contemplated for the site which is located on privately-held land.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
846	240 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Coquitlam, BC	The final concern is that transport be permitted only by barge and tug of the stated dimensions. Other aggregate developers elsewhere have suggested deep sea freighters to export valuable aggregate far afield. This would change the application entirely and would not be acceptable here.	Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic. Only tug and barge transport of aggregates is proposed.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
847	241 - 1	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	12 jobs in return for this project??	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
848	241 - 2	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	That is a totally unacceptable proposition -- this project will not only desecrate a recovering marine and terrestrial environment, but the noise pollution will be severe and carry for many kilometres. To confirm this, just visit the town of Egmont, across the water from the Lafarge quarry. The noise is excessive and totally unescapable - just as it the Burnco project will be.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
849	241 - 3	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	That is a totally unacceptable proposition -- this project will not only desecrate a recovering marine and terrestrial environment, but the noise pollution will be severe and carry for many kilometres. To confirm this, just visit the town of Egmont, across the water from the Lafarge quarry. The noise is excessive and totally unescapable - just as it the Burnco project will be.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
850	241 - 4	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	That is a totally unacceptable proposition -- this project will not only desecrate a recovering marine and terrestrial environment, but the noise pollution will be severe and carry for many kilometres. To confirm this, just visit the town of Egmont, across the water from the Lafarge quarry. The noise is excessive and totally unescapable - just as it the Burnco project will be.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
851	241 - 5	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	If you want to drive away tourism and make the north region of Howe Sound unliveable this is the project to do it.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
852	241 - 6	Michael Maser	Gibsons, BC	I live in nearby Gibsons and totally object to this project being approved.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
853	242 - 1	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	I am writing to voice my/our strong opposition to the large scale gravel mine that Burnco Rock Products Ltd. is proposing for McNab Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
854	242 - 2	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has had a history of industrial activity and been victim to the effects of mining, pulp and paper, etc for many years. Fortunately it now appears that the Sound is revitalising, becoming cleaner, and attracting the return of numerous kinds of wildlife. That together with its world class scenery contributes even further to its attraction, and adds a major asset to Vancouver, its residents and our tourist industry.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
855	242 - 3	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	To take a retrograde step and allow an Alberta based company to set up a crushing/gravel pit in this location is both alarming and questionable at best.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
856	242 - 4	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
857	242 - 5	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	Gravel pits by their very nature embody noise, airborne pollution and in this instance may have impact on the ocean due to its proximity.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
858	242 - 6	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	I believe there is gravel available to concrete manufacturers elsewhere and this proposed pit allows a relative newcomer to compete with the current players already in this field.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge fro Treat Creek (eas of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
859	242 - 7	Kathy Lunner	North Vancouver, BC	<p>We believe an approval of this application would be complete lack of foresight. In summary this is a small business opportunity with the potential for considerable environmental impact and yet with zero upside for both residents and visitors to the Lower Mainland and the Sunshine Coast . Please do not approve Burnco's application.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
860	243 - 1	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	<p>As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
861	243 - 2	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
862	243 - 3	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
863	243 - 4	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
864	243 - 5	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life</li> </ul>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
865	243 - 6	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Disruption to the elk, an at risk species	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
866	243 - 7	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
867	243 - 8	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Compromised air quality due to emissions	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
868	243 - 9	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
869	243 - 10	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
870	243 - 11	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
871	243 - 12	Julia Thiessen	Howe Sound, BC	We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery. The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
872	244 - 1	Devin Walchuk	Not Stated	I am strongly opposed to this proposal, this pristine location is in danger of losing it's beauty and tranquility that my family has enjoyed for years.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
873	244 - 2	Devin Walchuk	Not Stated	Not only are you greatly effecting a natural habitat, by dredging an estuary, you will be having a major impact on the people that have made McNabb creek home for generations.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
874	244 - 3	Devin Walchuk	Not Stated	Not only are you greatly effecting a natural habitat, by dredging an estuary, you will be having a major impact on the people that have made McNabb creek home for generations.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
875	245 - 1	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	I oppose the permitting of an aggregate mine by Burnco in Howe Sound. There is ample cause to deny Burnco's application for a permit to mine, process and ship aggregate in Howe Sound. The Lower Mainland, the Sea to Sky Corridor and the Sunshine Coast do not need a messy, risky -- and absolutely unnecessary -- aggregate mine on their doorstep.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
876	245 - 2	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	<p>While Burnco's application and the Notices are unclear as to the total amount of aggregate to be mined, processed and shipped, the highest number found in the documentation and displays is 20 million tonnes, spiking to 4 million tonnes a year (the Notices state 16 million tonnes). All of it would originate at the McNab Creek estuary in the heart of Howe Sound.</p> <p>To be barged 35 km into Vancouver, Burnco says the mine's total production, over 20 years, will supply less than one year's aggregate needs of the Lower Mainland. Burnco admits that it has other sources, and will use them.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
877	245 - 3	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Mined out, Burnco then will abandon the site, leaving a polluted, water-filled quarry. Burnco calls this a recreational lake. Will humans or wildlife be able to drink safely from it? Will there be public access?	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. The perimeter of the pit lake will be designed to allow for an escape route for large mammals (See Mitigation Measure M-5.3-55 described in Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS. The pit lake will be predominantly groundwater fed. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed applicable Water Quality Guidelines. Although the pit lake will be located on property owned by BURNCO and no public access or recreational use of the pit lake is proposed, the Public Health Assessment (Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS) concludes that there would be no significant risk to recreational users.</p>
878	245 - 4	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound is beautiful, environmentally sensitive, and worthy of protection. Anywhere else it would be national park. An unnecessary aggregate mine and processing plant at its heart is pointless.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
879	245 - 5	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound is beautiful, environmentally sensitive, and worthy of protection. Anywhere else it would be national park. An unnecessary aggregate mine and processing plant at its heart is pointless.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
880	245 - 6	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco's application to scoop, dredge and process in Howe Sound fails to provide reasonable assurance that its operation will not cause serious environmental, heritage, health, social and economic damage.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
881	245 - 7	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco implies that the history of more than 100 years of industrial abuse to the land, water, air and wildlife by others in Howe Sound is an important historical precedent and therefore is justification for further industrial activity. This is a specious argument, of course, and it is very disturbing that the applicant feels justified in advancing it. Because it is 2016.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
882	245 - 8	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco refers to historical precedent in its forced, second choice of a riskier shipping route through narrow Thornbrough Channel, past the YMCA Elphinstone youth camp and cutting across the Langdale ferry routes. Its first choice for a shipping route, safer and shorter, but in view from the Sea to Sky highway, Lions Bay and West Vancouver, attracted strong public opposition.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
883	245 - 9	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco refers to historical precedent in its forced, second choice of a riskier shipping route through narrow Thornbrough Channel, past the YMCA Elphinstone youth camp and cutting across the Langdale ferry routes. Its first choice for a shipping route, safer and shorter, but in view from the Sea to Sky highway, Lions Bay and West Vancouver, attracted strong public opposition.	Ramillies Channel is the preferred route. Thornbrough Channel is proposed only as an alternate, poor weather route.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
884	245 - 10	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco refers to historical precedent in its forced, second choice of a riskier shipping route through narrow Thornbrough Channel, past the YMCA Elphinstone youth camp and cutting across the Langdale ferry routes. Its first choice for a shipping route, safer and shorter, but in view from the Sea to Sky highway, Lions Bay and West Vancouver, attracted strong public opposition.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
885	245 - 11	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco has not addressed adequately some very important environmental effects: for example, how will it avoid, negate or mitigate the risk from sediment from the operation to the rare Glass Sponge Reefs in Howe Sound? The proposed mine is the biggest threat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
886	245 - 12	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco has been unconvincing in its attempts to address the legitimate concerns of the provincial and government and the public. For example, its claim that the 14 or so full-time equivalent jobs at the mine site will provide significant economic benefits is ridiculous. But the threat it poses to the environment, tourism and recreation is not.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
887	245 - 13	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco has been unconvincing in its attempts to address the legitimate concerns of the provincial and government and the public. For example, its claim that the 14 or so full-time equivalent jobs at the mine site will provide significant economic benefits is ridiculous. But the threat it poses to the environment, tourism and recreation is not.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
888	245 - 14	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Of course this mine should not be approved at any level, particularly before a holistic regional plan for the entire Howe Sound area has been put in place that takes into account Howe Sound's industrial, commercial, residential and recreational value, both existing and potential.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
889	246 - 1	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	I am writing today in response to Burnco application for a gravel pit at McNabb Creek estuary. As a long time resident of McNab Creek I must express my opposition to this project. I believe our Polite questions to Burnco were taken as cooperation. Contrary to what Burnco has suggested we are not in favour of a gravel pit. Reading through their application they have many of their fax incorrect. Too many to list, but I will touch base on a few.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
890	246 - 2	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The land that our community sits on was purchased August 6, 1968. The sunshine coast regional district granted residential zoning for this area. One of the original developers can Townson is still a member of our community. In the early 70s he began bringing cabins up by barge from Richmond and developed our community. Cabins at that time were selling for \$180,000. Since Burnco's intentions were made public seven years ago, property values have dropped, and been stagnant. No one wants to invest across from an area where proposed gravel pit may be approved. While the rest of Vancouver and the lower mainland have experienced huge increases in their residential values hours continues to drop and be of no interest to people looking for recreational enjoyment.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
891	246 - 3	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	I would like to express what this community has meant to us. This community because of its remoteness and it's lack of power and services, has been a blessing in disguise's. Many of the residents have been at McNabb for many years we have spent our summers there each year, with our children, and now grandchildren. We enjoy a way of life there, without technology out of TVs, phones, and Electricity, that is hard to describe. It is a place where there is conversation at dinner, games to be played on the beach, fishing and hiking and swimming. Where we must help each other because there is no one else to call. We have become a community of very close neighbors. Our community and our way of life that we have cherished over the last 40 years is at risk of coming to an end.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
892	246 - 4	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>SCRD Mission Statement; (sunshine coast regional district) The SCRDR Plays a variety of roles – planner, protector, provider, and community builder – in collaboration with volunteers, other service providers, community groups, and partners to provide A system of highquality and accessible parks, trails, beach access, facilities, recreational services, volunteerism, and special events in a manner that is integrated, thoughtfully planned, responsive, well-maintained, and fiscally responsible. To benefit the health and vitality of all individuals, families, communities,and the region as a whole. The sunshine coast regional district executive summary states; "it's population of 30,000 a full-time residence and a segment of parttime residence value a healthy active lifestyle and embrace a variety of recreational opportunities parks and recreation facilities, services, special events, and community engagement opportunities help build stronger communities by providing enjoyment and social connections and encouraging physical activity among people of all ages and ability levels. "</p>	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</p> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
893	246 - 5	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>This proposed Burnco gravel pit will be 150 feet deep in the middle of one of the last estuaries, and the only beach in the Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
894	246 - 6	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>It will adversely affect thousands of people at the yacht clubs, kids camps and most directly our community.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
895	246 - 7	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	It is directly across the river from our residences (450 feet) and the noise levels they have proposed are unacceptable and unrealistic. There are huge discrepancies in their testing of predictive noise levels.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
896	246 - 8	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
897	246 - 9	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
898	246 - 10	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.
899	246 - 11	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
900	246 - 12	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
901	246 - 13	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
902	246 - 14	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our community, and we use this remote and Pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation, love and respect of nature, for their children and all generations to come.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.
903	246 - 15	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	We at McNab Creek community have paid our taxes for 40 years towards schools, libraries, infrastructure, and services that we do not have in our area. We ask that you consider, our community, and our contribution over many years of taxes paid. We ask that you recognize how this directly contradicts the sunshine coast mission statement. We also ask that you do not turn a slow and struggling recovery of our beautiful Howe Sound back to the industrial past.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
904	247 - 1	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	I am writing today in response to Burnco application for a gravel pit at McNabb Creek estuary. As a long time resident of McNab Creek I must express my opposition to this project. I believe our Polite questions to Burnco were taken as cooperation. Contrary to what Burnco has suggested we are not in favour of a gravel pit. Reading through their application they have many of their fax incorrect. Too many to list, but I will touch base on a few.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
905	247 - 2	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>The land that our community sits on was purchased August 6, 1968. The sunshine coast regional district granted residential zoning for this area. One of the original developers can Townson is still a member of our community. In the early 70s he began bringing cabins up by barge from Richmond and developed our community. Cabins at that time were selling for \$180,000. Since Burnco's intentions were made public seven years ago, property values have dropped, and been stagnant. No one wants to invest across from an area where proposed gravel pit may be approved. While the rest of Vancouver and the lower mainland have experienced huge increases in their residential values hours continues to drop and be of no interest to people looking for recreational enjoyment.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
906	247 - 3	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>I would like to express what this community has meant to us. This community because of its remoteness and it's lack of power and services, has been a blessing in disguise's. Many of the residents have been at McNabb for many years we have spent our summers there each year, with our children, and now grandchildren. We enjoy a way of life there, without technology out of TVs, phones, and Electricity, that is hard to describe. It is a place where there is conversation at dinner, games to be played on the beach, fishing and hiking and swimming. Where we must help each other because there is no one else to call. We have become a community of very close neighbors. Our community and our way of life that we have cherished over the last 40 years is at risk of coming to an end.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
907	247 - 4	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>SCRD Mission Statement; (sunshine coast regional district) The SCRDR Plays a variety of roles – planner, protector, provider, and community builder – in collaboration with volunteers, other service providers, community groups, and partners to provide A system of highquality and accessible parks, trails, beach access, facilities, recreational services, volunteerism, and special events in a manner that is integrated, thoughtfully planned, responsive, well-maintained, and fiscally responsible. To benefit the health and vitality of all individuals, families, communities,and the region as a whole. The sunshine coast regional district executive summary states; "it's population of 30,000 a full-time residence and a segment of parttime residence value a healthy active lifestyle and embrace a variety of recreational opportunities parks and recreation facilities, services, special events, and community engagement opportunities help build stronger communities by providing enjoyment and social connections and encouraging physical activity among people of all ages and ability levels. "</p>	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</p> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
908	247 - 5	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>This proposed Burnco gravel pit will be 150 feet deep in the middle of one of the last estuaries, and the only beach in the Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
909	247 - 6	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	<p>It will adversely affect thousands of people at the yacht clubs, kids camps and most directly our community.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
910	247 - 7	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	It is directly across the river from our residences (450 feet) and the noise levels they have proposed are unacceptable and unrealistic. There are huge discrepancies in their testing of predictive noise levels.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
911	247 - 8	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
912	247 - 9	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
913	247 - 10	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.
914	247 - 11	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The only people we see that stand to gain by this, is Burnco. The loss of property values at McNab and Gambier island as well as the social and economic losses for the towns and businesses in tourism dollars, will be largely felt.	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
915	247 - 12	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
916	247 - 13	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Hearing from Burrard yacht club, ( one of three yacht clubs on Gambier island) stating their club has spent roughly \$250,000 in Gibsons and Pender Harbour on fuel, groceries, restaurants, etc. I can only imagine the losses when you add all the communities together, that will no longer want to spend their recreational time in a noisy industrial area. The economic impact on local businesses in the Howe Sound will be largely felt.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
917	247 - 14	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	The McNab Creek estuary remains both rare and productive. It is a living breathing science project directly opposite our community, and we use this remote and Pristine area to educate our children/grandchildren the value of conservation, love and respect of nature, for their children and all generations to come.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.
918	247 - 15	Lynne Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	We at McNab Creek community have paid our taxes for 40 years towards schools, libraries, infrastructure, and services that we do not have in our area. We ask that you consider, our community, and our contribution over many years of taxes paid. We ask that you recognize how this directly contradicts the sunshine coast mission statement. We also ask that you do not turn a slow and struggling recovery of our beautiful Howe Sound back to the industrial past.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
919	248 - 1	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	I hope the BURNCO Aggregate mine environmental assessment process takes my concerns into account. I attended an information session in Gibsons, and I have read many documents pertaining to this application. I am a Public Health Nurse; I work both on the Sunshine Coast and on the North Shore.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
920	248 - 2	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	My family vacations in Howe Sound near the mine site; my children have attended youth camps that will be affected by the mine. In due course my grandchildren will attend these youth camps.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation effects - including youth camps - are considered in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
921	248 - 3	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	Howe Sound offers my urban family the experience of being close to nature that is unique, not only in Canada , but in the world. We cannot understand why such a mine, which will detract from their experience over the next 20 years, and in some aspects, forever, would be considered in Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
922	248 - 4	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	The mine is not needed and there are many other sources of aggregate in B.C.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
923	248 - 5	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	The mine is not needed and there are many other sources of aggregate in B.C.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
924	248 - 6	Jackie Rohan	Not Stated	The firm that is applying for the permit is 100 years old. It's mindset is obviously stuck in 1916, when industry was allowed to wreck havoc in Howe Sound. Please do not approve this application.	BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.  BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.  BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge fro Treat Creek (eas of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
925	249 - 1	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	As a Gambier Island resident, I am writing to express my serious concerns about the proposed Burnco open pit mine operation at McNab Creek.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
926	249 - 2	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	Howe Sound is one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor. Howe Sound is the home to a great variety of mammals, fish, frogs, rare birds and invertebrates. It supports jobs in the local economy, especially tourism which has a significant ripple effect through the region's economy, and brings pleasure to thousands of locals and tourists every year.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area. BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
927	249 - 3	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	We all cherish and celebrate the recovery of Howe Sound after decades of toxic pollution from heavy industry. BC taxpayers paid millions to clean up the Britannia mine in Howe Sound and now finally those actions, along with other conservation efforts, are paying off with the return of fish stocks, dolphins, orcas, whales and a proliferation of bald eagles and other wildlife.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
928	249 - 4	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
929	249 - 5	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	We support the creation of a long term comprehensive land and water use plan for economic and social activities in the region that are compatible with sustainable uses of the Howe Sound.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
930	249 - 6	Tiffany Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	We ask you to stop this ill-advised project that will destroy a portion of this amazing natural resource, all for the sake of the short term profits of a mining company.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
931	250 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I concur with all the overwhelming opposition to this project noted on this EA comment page. Certainly, this project cannot continue given all of the opposition and problematic concerns listed here.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
932	251 - 1	Spider Robinson	Gambier Island, BC	I strongly oppose Burnco's proposed destruction of the McNab Estuary and its conversion from an environmental treasure to an active mining operation, in a rural residential region. I have lived near active mines, and I would not wish that on you or on anyone in government, unless Tronald Dump wins. Please return the favor. Don't sell us out to profiteers for dollars. We remember things like that a LONG time.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
933	252 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Visual Impacts</p> <p>The visual impacts overlook the views from the property owners directly across from the mine at higher elevations. The consultant said they did not consider the views from these homes due to the property being private which limited their access. It would be in the interest of these property owners to allow access to the consultants in order to know what the visual impact would be. The attached photo was taken from one of the lots and it appears they would see the operations area. More studies should be done as changing this view could have significant impact on property values.</p> <p>Another comment I heard about the visuals – the lights at the project site and barge loading were being compared to the lights at Howe Sound Pulp and Paper. The residents at McNab do not see Howe Sound Pulp and Paper but the story boards implied they do. For the McNab Strata residents, this project impacts their current night time views.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Estates Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The McNab Strata viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed; this publically accessible location would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata.</p> <p>The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use. The assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions is limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exists are may be certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p> <p>BURNCO has committed to establishing a mutually agreeable mechanism for engaging with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of benefit and concern.</p>
934	253 - 1	Lois Neu	North Vancouver, BC	Please do not allow the Bunco Aggregate Project to go forward!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
935	253 - 2	Lois Neu	North Vancouver, BC	I am a keen outdoors person and recreational user of this area. I cannot imagine trying to paddle board or kayak in the Douglas Bay or across the water, while dodging barges and listening to the hammer hammer hammer of rock crushing up the valley.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
936	253 - 3	Lois Neu	North Vancouver, BC	I am a keen outdoors person and recreational user of this area. I cannot imagine trying to paddle board or kayak in the Douglas Bay or across the water, while dodging barges and listening to the hammer hammer hammer of rock crushing up the valley.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
937	253 - 4	Lois Neu	North Vancouver, BC	I am a keen outdoors person and recreational user of this area. I cannot imagine trying to paddle board or kayak in the Douglas Bay or across the water, while dodging barges and listening to the hammer hammer hammer of rock crushing up the valley.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
938	253 - 5	Lois Neu	North Vancouver, BC	Human progress can be measured in many ways, one of which should be preserving Howe Sound for its public recreational usage and beauty. Please prioritize land and wilderness preservation in our province and in particular in Howe Sound! Thank you.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
939	254 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	I have many concerns about the Burnco project coming to McNab Creek and the effect it will have on the wild life and land around the gravel pit.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
940	254 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	Currently there are eagles, bears, wolves, cougars, deer and the list goes on in that area. Last weekend I spotted a bear right where the barge would come in and out of, but yet you still are proposing to use this area and state animals will not be effected or what about the whales that swam by a few weeks ago.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
941	254 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	Currently there are eagles, bears, wolves, cougars, deer and the list goes on in that area. Last weekend I spotted a bear right where the barge would come in and out of, but yet you still are proposing to use this area and state animals will not be effected or what about the whales that swam by a few weeks ago.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
942	254 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	This is also a very public place and one of the few left in the Howe Sound, not to mention BC, where boats can pull up and anchor and swim or kayak, this project will destroy this by polluting the water and becoming a unsafe area for all and hazardous.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
943	254 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	On another note, all the cabins or docks in the area will be effected by the actual gravel itself in the air which can create health problems or worsen some health issues if inhaled, please go somewhere else, where you will not be ruining a great area to only create a couple of jobs.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
944	254 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	On another note, all the cabins or docks in the area will be effected by the actual gravel itself in the air which can create health problems or worsen some health issues if inhaled, please go somewhere else, where you will not be ruining a great area to only create a couple of jobs.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
945	254 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	If you are commenting and have not been to the Howe Sound, go take a look and you will see how bad of an idea this is. We need to be considerate of the environment and wild life beautiful BC has to offer especially at McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
946	255 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	This project is quite disturbing and totally unnecessary.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
947	255 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	As a resident of Howe Sound I do not want my grandchildren, and the rest of our family to have our lives put at risk with the dangerous pollutants that this proposed gravel pit will emit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
948	255 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Why Here in Beautiful Howe Sound would you try to destroy our environment .Find somewhere in Alberta to obtain gravel and leave our land and water alone. We do not need you here.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge fro Treat Creek (eas of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
949	255 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	We have enough suppliers of gravel to meet B.Cs need for years to come, and you will be taking Jobs away from our Local Work Force..	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
950	256 - 1	Jessica Nelson	Whistler, BC	I am not supportive of the Burnco Mine project and am concerned regarding the risks to the McNab Creek Estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
951	256 - 2	Jessica Nelson	Whistler, BC	Please do NOT approve this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
952	257 - 1	Patrick Walsh	Aurora, ON	If you've ever been to beautiful Howe Sound, you'll know how ecologically, geographically and culturally significant it is. The risks to the environment alone are not worth the benefits of this project, and the blight it will make on the landscape is decidedly not conducive to beautiful B.C. How this even got this far is mind-boggling. Please stop it.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
953	258 - 1	Sheila Kinnear	Gibsons, BC	<p>I've frequented Thunderbird Yacht Club's outstation at Ekins Point since 1981 and have spent many hours contemplating the beauty of the valley across the way.</p> <p>A consultant hired by Burnco tried to assure me that I would not be able to hear anything from</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
954	258 - 2	Sheila Kinnear	Gibsons, BC	A consultant hired by Burnco tried to assure me that I would not be able to hear anything from Burnco's operation. I simply don't believe him.	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare and environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>
955	258 - 3	Sheila Kinnear	Gibsons, BC	A consultant hired by Burnco tried to assure me that I would not be able to hear anything from Burnco's operation. I simply don't believe him.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
956	258 - 4	Sheila Kinnear	Gibsons, BC	A consultant hired by Burnco tried to assure me that I would not be able to hear anything from Burnco's operation. I simply don't believe him.	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.
957	259 - 1	Mike	Muskoka, ON	Before I moved back to Ontario I spent many years on the west coast and have visited Howe Sound many times. I think it is a travesty that there is even a chance that an area filled with such serene beauty is being threatened by a big corporation like Burnco. With so many potential negative environmental impacts and little - if any - positive impacts for the community of Howe Sound it is a wonder that this project is even being considered.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
958	259 - 2	Mike	Muskoka, ON	<p>Before I moved back to Ontario I spent many years on the west coast and have visited Howe Sound many times. I think it is a travesty that there is even a chance that an area filled with such serene beauty is being threatened by a big corporation like Burnco. With so many potential negative environmental impacts and little - if any - positive impacts for the community of Howe Sound it is a wonder that this project is even being considered.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
959	260 - 1	Dennise Dombroski	Gibsons, BC	<p>This project seems to exist solely for the benefit of Burnco. There is no apparent benefit to the neighbouring towns, and no long term benefit to the citizens of BC. 12 jobs, which may or may not be filled by local residents is not enough to justify the inevitable loss of tourism opportunities of this ecological gem, not to mention the destruction of the recently rejuvenated wildlife mecca. There must be more thought put into the long term benefits. I am tired of seeing BC's resources being squandered for short term minimal gain.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
960	261 - 1	Peter Hill	Vancouver, BC	<p>I have been visiting Anvil Island for the lat 60 years. Only in the last five years have I seen Howe Sound bounce back with whales, dolphins, salmon and herring. Please don't upset this beautiful delicate ecology with a gravel pit that will damage salmon estuary.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
961	261 - 2	Peter Hill	Vancouver, BC	<p>I have been visiting Anvil Island for the lat 60 years. Only in the last five years have I seen Howe Sound bounce back with whales, dolphins, salmon and herring. Please don't upset this beautiful delicate ecology with a gravel pit that will damage salmon estuary.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
962	261 - 3	Peter Hill	Vancouver, BC	I have been visiting Anvil Island for the last 60 years. Only in the last five years have I seen Howe Sound bounce back with whales, dolphins, salmon and herring. Please don't upset this beautiful delicate ecology with a gravel pit that will damage salmon estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity or quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
963	261 - 4	Peter Hill	Vancouver, BC	I have been visiting Anvil Island for the last 60 years. Only in the last five years have I seen Howe Sound bounce back with whales, dolphins, salmon and herring. Please don't upset this beautiful delicate ecology with a gravel pit that will damage salmon estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
964	262 - 1	Pascal	Squamish, BC	Will increased shipping traffic affect sea and howe sound sea life, fauna and flora?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential changes in water, sediment and habitat quality from in-water works and propeller scour, and potential injury/mortality from in-water works, propeller scour and vessel strikes. Measures for mitigating potential effects from marine traffic on marine resources are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of potential residual effects on marine resources were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
965	262 - 2	Pascal	Squamish, BC	Will increased shipping traffic affect sea and howe sound sea life, fauna and flora?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
966	262 - 3	Pascal	Squamish, BC	Burnco says it will be an awesome project, have a lake, etc etc. I dont see the point of having another lake, we are in Canada!!!! Nature is best without human interaction. I think this kind of industrial project should be far from human habitat. This definitively isnt the right place to have Burnco ruining everything. Howe Sound is beautiful I hope the Government will assess right. There are more important things than money and profit.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
967	262 - 4	Pascal	Squamish, BC	<p>Burnco says it will be an awesome project, have a lake, etc etc. I dont see the point of having another lake, we are in Canada!!!!</p> <p>Nature is best without human interaction. I think this kind of industrial project should be far from human habitat. This definitively isnt the right place to have Burnco ruining everything. Howe Sound is beautiful I hope the Government will assess right. There are more important things than money and profit.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
968	263 - 1	Don Barthel	Vancouver, BC	<p>Salmon are under pressure from many projects in this province. This project in particular threatens salmon spawning grounds. Please deny the applicants application and cancel the project.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
969	264 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Stop destroying our natural habitats,are their not enough gravel pits already!!	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
970	264 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Stop destroying our natural habitats,are their not enough gravel pits already!!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
971	265 - 1	Mark Evans	Gibsons, BC	It is understandable to extract raw resources, especially when they are easily transported to a large centre. However, this area has recently recovered from extensive logging and is now to be the focus of soil extraction. There are many areas on the coast where soil extraction and logging activities have left equipment and dilapidated infrastructure rusting on the shore.6 Remediation of these areas is now the tax payers responsibility. If soil extraction is allowed to proceed bonds must be posted to ensure that should the company face insolvency reclamation can be completed.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
972	265 - 2	Mark Evans	Gibsons, BC	Benefits to the community have been cited to be 12 jobs. These may or may not go to members of the neighbouring communities. There must be more tangible benefits to the nearby communities, such as a road to link Woodfibre to Port Mellon. This would also benefit the area by providing emergency access. Now is the time to ensure that projects such as this benefit all Canadians, not just the investors and employees of Burnco.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
973	266 - 1	Tyler Smith	North Vancouver, BC	BAD BAD idea in beautiful location have been going there for FORTY years do not wreck it now	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
974	267 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I highly oppose the Bunco Aggregate Mine project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
975	267 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I spend a lot of time exploring Howe Sound on the water with my young kids. It is home to some incredible wildlife that is again thriving. This mine would be a disaster to natural salmon habitats.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
976	267 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Let's promote tourism in this area instead of heavy industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
977	268 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Just say no.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
978	269 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	We, as a society, are finally coming to grips with the damage we are inflicting on our natural environment under the guise of creating so called economic benefits for the greater good of the masses. This is a worldwide problem often initiated by investors and championed by politicians who at times allow self interest to conflict with making the right decisions.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
979	269 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The proposed Burnco Aggregate Mine Project appears to generate little or no social or financial benefits for British Columbians.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
980	269 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	However, it remains a threat to the ecology and to our current and future quiet enjoyment of one of the most beautiful stretches of coast line in our Province.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
981	269 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	A review of the present submissions should make it self evident there are many concerned individuals who do not back this project and unless there are extremely valid reasons to the contrary, most responsible governments would respond to this sort of public discourse in a positive and supportive manner. Please refuse to approve Burnco's application and let this part of Howe Sound be conserved for all to enjoy now and for generations to follow.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
982	270 - 1	Tom Franklin	Squamish, BC	As frequent boater to the area I am appalled at this proposal. The only truly sandy beach on Howe Sound and so lose to Vancouver. Huge fish and wildlife values. Should be a law against this	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
983	271 - 1	Danny Shanks	Keats Island, BC	Keep Howe Sound as natural as possible. Where in the world is there a better place to be left alone. Past industry has done great harm to Howe sound. Orca's and Humpback whales Are finally returning after years without them. The sound is recovering It's not the time to take s step backwards.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
984	271 - 2	Danny Shanks	Keats Island, BC	<p>Keep Howe Sound as natural as possible. Where in the world is there a better place to be left alone. Past industry has done great harm to Howe sound. Orca's and Humpback whales Are finally returning after years without them. The sound is recovering It's not the time to take s step backwards.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
985	272 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>It is increasingly rare to find unspoiled nature in close proximity to a major urban centre. There is massive value in such an amenity. I ask that government not underestimate this value which is recognized by both current and future generations. Howe Sound is, in part, such an amenity. Increasing commercial and industrial land uses in the Sound will in most cases be very poor public policy. In the inevitable exercise of balancing competing interests, be mindful of what a rare treasure Howe Sound is.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
986	273 - 1	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	I am concerned that for only 12 mere jobs, the risk to our environment of the Howe Sound, let alone the livelihood of the neighbouring communities, such as the loss of quality of life from the noise reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean and from the industrial activity and the decline in property values and natural capital values, outweigh the job potential.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
987	273 - 2	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	I am concerned that for only 12 mere jobs, the risk to our environment of the Howe Sound, let alone the livelihood of the neighbouring communities, such as the loss of quality of life from the noise reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean and from the industrial activity and the decline in property values and natural capital values, outweigh the job potential.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
988	273 - 3	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	I am concerned that for only 12 mere jobs, the risk to our environment of the Howe Sound, let alone the livelihood of the neighbouring communities, such as the loss of quality of life from the noise reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean and from the industrial activity and the decline in property values and natural capital values, outweigh the job potential.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
989	273 - 4	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	Also, the Howe Sound watersheds provide an estimated annual value of \$800 million to \$4.7 billion in ecosystem services. The effects on marine life, wildlife, fish and recovering Howe Sound cannot be accurately predetermined.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
990	273 - 5	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	Also of concern is the rezoning from current rural RU-2 to industrial use. Rezoning increases industrial land use in Howe Sound not protection, and can adversely affect the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
991	273 - 6	Sarah Valentine	Pemberton, BC	The cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River power project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley just exponentially affects the Howe.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
992	274 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Imagine finally having the waters of Howe Sound being clean enough to to sustain the Orcas, salmon, dolphins, crab, seals, after years of struggling to sustain these vital creatures of our precious West Coast. It's time we stop putting into jeopardy, our surrounding waters and environment. There is no need to keep threatening our most valuable resources with these short sighted projects. It's time to think more responsibly!!	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
993	274 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Imagine finally having the waters of Howe Sound being clean enough to sustain the Orcas, salmon, dolphins, crab, seals, after years of struggling to sustain these vital creatures of our precious West Coast. It's time we stop putting into jeopardy, our surrounding waters and environment. There is no need to keep threatening our most valuable resources with these short sighted projects. It's time to think more responsibly!!	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
994	275 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Howe sound is NO place for a massive gravel pit! I have property on Gambier island and I strongly oppose this project. What an awful place to put an open pit, home to so many important species. The environmental assessment process is clearly a sham!!!	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
995	276 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Noise pollution, estuary destruction, wildlife destruction, marine life destruction, natural beautiful area destruction. What more need one say?	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
996	276 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Noise pollution, estuary destruction, wildlife destruction, marine life destruction, natural beautiful area destruction. What more need one say?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
997	276 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Noise pollution, estuary destruction, wildlife destruction, marine life destruction, natural beautiful area destruction. What more need one say?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
998	276 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Noise pollution, estuary destruction, wildlife destruction, marine life destruction, natural beautiful area destruction. What more need one say?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
999	276 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Noise pollution, estuary destruction, wildlife destruction, marine life destruction, natural beautiful area destruction. What more need one say?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1000	276 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Is there not some other place along the thousands of miles of coastline or islands where such an operation could be better placed????	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1001	276 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Howe Sound needs to continue mending from its prior mishandling by man. This project will do nothing to mend the Sound but on the contrary will exacerbate damage to the fragile eco system.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1002	277 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Nanoose Bay, BC	Stop this Insane Popen out mine Utterly silly	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1003	278 - 1	Ray and Elspeth Bradbury	West Vancouver, BC	We are absolutely opposed to the proposed Burnco Aggregate Mine Project on Howe Sound, BC.	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1004	278 - 2	Ray and Elspeth Bradbury	West Vancouver, BC	We are disgusted with the broken environmental assessment process which automatically grants approval without proper consultation with residents or with First Nations.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
1005	278 - 3	Ray and Elspeth Bradbury	West Vancouver, BC	As residents of the Howe Sound area this catastrophic mine proposal would impact us directly, both as an environmental stupidity of a disaster and in the increased heavy traffic out of the sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1006	278 - 4	Ray and Elspeth Bradbury	West Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound, which people and governments have worked hard to clean up after the Britannia Mine mess, should be declared a national Park and a UNESCO biosphere treasure.  The Sound is no place for LNG plants or heavy extraction and pollution such as the Burnco outrage.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1007	279 - 1	Harold Stirland	Courtenay, BC	The McNab Creek flats are a most unique and valuable component of the natural environment of Howe Sound, now under threat from industry.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1008	279 - 2	Harold Stirland	Courtenay, BC	I visited this area several times, and have seen for myself that a place of such rare qualities must not be destroyed for profit or jobs. Please recognize that the public interest should rule, in this case.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1009	280 - 1	Alexander	Briggs, AB	I am opposed to the development of this gravel mine in the McNab creek estuary.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1010	280 - 2	Alexander	Briggs, AB	I am opposed to the development of this gravel mine in the McNab creek estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1011	280 - 3	Alexander	Briggs, AB	This environment should be preserved as it is sensitive and fragile wildlife habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1012	281 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I think it is stupid to put this mine in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1013	281 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	This whole area should be protected for the enjoyment of the huge population of Vancouver just around the corner from Horseshoe Bay.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1014	281 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I do not like people making these sort of decisions who have no attachment to this or any other area.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
1015	282 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Roberts Creek, BC	The fact that there is even an option for a company to mine anything in the sensitive over used eco system of Howe sound is completely ignorant .I am against this mine proposal and any caring rational person would be .	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1016	283 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Simply, this is like the stick that breaks the camels back. It's just one more 'development'[stick]. But it will prove to be a messy development at the cost of Howe Sound's recovery from years of pollution, chemical, noise, debris from operations.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1017	283 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Noise carries a great distance and a few trees will not stop that sound travel.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1018	283 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Granted Port Mellon is nearby but do we need to keep saying that since one is there another is OK. I think this development will prove to be short sighted and destructive. Stop it.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1019	284 - 1	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>As past Director of the Vancouver Aquarium put it "If Howe Sound were in any other part of the world, it would be a great national park"</p> <p>We need to protect our lands, our waters and our resources, selling off our land, water &amp; resources for profit is not saving our world for our children.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1020	284 - 2	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1021	284 - 3	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to 'strong arm' the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as "the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat".	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1022	284 - 4	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1023	284 - 5	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1024	284 - 6	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1025	284 - 7	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1026	284 - 8	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1027	284 - 9	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1028	284 - 10	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1029	284 - 11	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1030	284 - 12	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1031	284 - 13	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1032	284 - 14	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1033	284 - 15	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1034	284 - 16	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	<p>How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1035	284 - 17	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1036	284 - 18	Concerned Resident	Squamish, BC	Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver’s ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see “SuperNatural, British Columbia”, how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1037	285 - 1	Fern Walker	Sechelt, BC	The environment comes first. Nature must be preserved not destroyed. The estuary, and salmon runs are a top priority. The land and waters are just starting to come back to their natural state for sea and wildlife.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1038	286 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Stop risking important estuaries for these projects! The science does not allow projects like this to be successful.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1039	286 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Noise reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1040	286 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Decline in property values and natural capital values. Howe Sound watersheds provide an estimated annual value of \$800 million to \$4.7 billion in ecosystem services.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1041	286 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- No benefit to the local community, only loss of quality of life from noise and industrial activity.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1042	286 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Effects on marine life, wildlife, fish and recovering Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1043	286 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Effect on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1044	286 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Rezoning from current rural RU-2 to industrial use.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1045	286 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Rezoning increases industrial land use in Howe Sound not protection.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1046	286 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Indirect and direct job losses due to negative effects of the mine on other economies in the area for only 12 permanent jobs created.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1047	286 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River power project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1048	286 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	- Future expansion of the mine beyond 16 years and its current size.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
1049	286 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	STOP WASTING TAXPAYERS MONEY!	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1050	287 - 1	Susan Quipp	Victoria, BC	NO, NO, NO. After the great return to ecological health after the industrial desecration of the previous century, it would be stupid to make the same mistakes with modern understanding. Industry must develop new building materials for toads, commercial and residential buildings etc. A river is no place for this kind of destructive Projects! It should be an automatic NO, if we had any protection for lakes and rivers left.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1051	288 - 1	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	It is my strong opinion that the Burnco aggregate removal project in Howe Sound is an unfortunate example of incredible poor land management. It is not in concert with the Sound communities and is a retrograde step environmentally.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1052	288 - 2	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1053	288 - 3	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1054	288 - 4	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1055	288 - 5	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1056	288 - 6	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	The latest Golder study, though extensive in some areas still contains considerable weakness in its assumptions and methodology.	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1057	288 - 7	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	We understand that Burnco claim that the Sound's use over the last one hundred years has been one of industrial activity. This is a shameful statement as we the public and you the government have over recent years made such tremendous strides in its reparation. It is now becoming once again a beautiful natural Lower Mainland asset that we can have pride in, and visitors can admire.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1058	288 - 8	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	We urge the government to deny approval to a project of this nature. It has little economic upside outside of Burnco's profitability and yet has so much impact and risk to this scenic and natural environment on our doorstep.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1059	288 - 9	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	In summary a regional plan for the development of Howe Sound is crucial, it would enable criteria and guide lines for any proposed activities and avoid long expensive processes such as we are involved in at the moment.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1060	289 - 1	Jo Phillips	Sooke, BC	No mines in McNabb Creek in Howe Sound. Business is not the most important thing in the world. Preserving the natural ecosystem that nurtures us is crucial to all of our survival. This is a crucial habitat. Please actually assess the environment which is the task we have trusted you with.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1061	290 - 1	Ken McMaster	Surrey, BC	I have summered on Anvil Island for over fifty years now and have in recent years witnessed the return of dolphin and orca populations as a result of new regulations that have improved the water quality in Howe Sound. I have fished off McNabb Creek for Pink Salmon. I think it would be a tragedy to allow the Bunco Aggregate Mine Project to go ahead.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1062	290 - 2	Ken McMaster	Surrey, BC	I have summered on Anvil Island for over fifty years now and have in recent years witnessed the return of dolphin and orca populations as a result of new regulations that have improved the water quality in Howe Sound. I have fished off McNabb Creek for Pink Salmon. I think it would be a tragedy to allow the Bunco Aggregate Mine Project to go ahead.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1063	290 - 3	Ken McMaster	Surrey, BC	I urge you to deny this request.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1064	291 - 1	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Hydrology – McNab Valley Environmental Watershed Sustainability</p> <p>With all due respect there does not seem to be a clear logical understanding of how the tidal estuary water flows will be maintained while balancing the pit/pond level requirements over the life of the project or into the future.</p> <p>The proponent’s initial proposal was to form a trench/creek above the road on the west side of the property that would collect both surface and subsurface water draining from the west side of the valley. This collected water flow was then to be controlled via overflow weirs to satisfy the hydraulic requirements of both the pit/pond and the tidal estuary.</p> <p>Following the initial Public Open House session wherein we asked how the pit/pond replenishment requirements of roughly 230,000 US gallons per day would be met it now appears that the previous scheme has been abandoned. At the most recent Public Open House it was stated by Golder’s hydrologist that the water coming off the west side of the valley is both insufficient in volume and of insufficient quality to meet the project water requirements. The level of the pit/pond will now be maintained by subsurface water flows coming directly down out of the McNab valley that are supposedly far in excess of the pit/pond requirements. The remaining subsurface water flows are then supposed to flow under/through the berm/dam structure (purple lined area on the Proposed Conceptual Site Layout diagram) to maintain the current</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1065	291 - 2	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>1. BURNCO's original proposal described the existing gravel fish channel acting as a "French Drain" on the subsurface water flow in this area of the McNab valley, thereby literally draining the natural water table in this area of the lower McNab valley. Looking at the proponents subsurface water table maps/charts this fish channel does appear to be a roughly the lowest point in the valley water table which tends to agree with BURNCO's description that it drains the valley. However, the proponent's initial excavation area is shown in relatively elevated porous ground on the west side of this site that appears to be considerably above the fish channel elevation. During these initial project phases how does the proponent expect to maintain the pit/pond level if the existing fish channel tends to dry up during the summer months? Will the initial pit be excavated to a depth below the fish channel using conventional excavation equipment which will then tend to further drain the existing fish channel into the excavated pit/pond.</p>	<p>The elevation of the base of the groundwater channel, a large structure that crosses most of the footprint of the proposed pit, is at about 2.5 m in its upper portion and decreases towards the shoreline. Before construction of the mine, the water table is depressed to this level as the channel removes any water above this elevation as surface water. The groundwater channel (e.g., the fish channel) will be blocked in the first year of operations; as a result the water backs up behind this blockage and the water level in the channel rises, resulting in an increase in the local groundwater levels, a flattening of the groundwater gradient between McNab Creek and the Project site and a reduction in the rate of flow from McNab Creek to the groundwater system. In the early stages of operation the open pit is relatively small and there are less losses from McNab Creek compared to baseline conditions. As the pit becomes large it approaches the flow from McNab Creek that is occurring under baseline conditions (pre-mining).</p> <p>The existing channel demonstrates reductions in surface water flows during the summer months, however, groundwater still flows through the system at depth. The pit will be excavated to elevation -35 m, much deeper than the existing channel, and below the groundwater table.</p>
1066	291 - 3	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>2. BURNCO's proposal is to construct a dam on the fish channel towards the middle of the project to raise the water table behind the berm in order to maintain the pit/pond operating level (replenishing 226,921 Gallons Per Day for 365 days of the year [NOTE calculation provided]). The excess volume of the subsurface water will then continue to flow under/through the berm to distribute the flows to the tidal estuary area and creeks. With seasonal variation in drainage flow requirements how will the water table level be controlled to suit the dredge requirements without allowing the pit/pond water to flow freely over the dam? You can't adjust the hydrostatic head created by the pond level while maintaining the pit/pond level for optimum dredging purposes.</p>	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1067	291 - 4	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>3. As the size of the pit/pond is increased in both coverage and depth an ever increasing volume of the existing "subsurface" material will be removed (down to bedrock?). As this occurs an increasing volume of the subsurface water will then actually flow through the open pit/pond (confirmed by Golder). Over the 16 years of operation the fines will accumulate in the pit/pond water when the finer materials that are not removed by the dredging remain or flow back into the pit/pond along with any rock crushing dust that may find its way into the pond. These accumulated fines will then settle preferentially on the "downstream" side of the pond when carried by the subsurface water flowing through the pond towards the ocean. This ongoing deposition of fines on the downstream side of the pond over the 16 year life of the project will seriously reduce or eliminate the porosity of the pond's downstream wall thereby seriously limiting any subsurface drainage out of the pond to the tidal estuary area. As the pit/pond is expanded to its full proposed size (covering the lower area of the McNab valley) the accumulated settled fines could significantly restrict this high volume subsurface flow draining out of the McNab valley which could then breach the proposed flood control dam and/or overflow the berm with poor quality pit/pond water carrying the accumulated fines. How does the proponent intend to address the issue of decreasing the porosity of the pond perimeter walls over time that are required to maintain the ongoing underflow and filtration of subsurface water passing through the pit/pond to the tidal estuary as the pit/pond is expanded to its proposed maximum size that literally fills the bottom of the McNab valley? If the existing subsurface water</p>	<p>Based on our assessment and analysis of the geologic and hydrogeologic conditions at the Site, it is not anticipated that the accumulation of fines on the downgradient face of the excavation will have a significant impact on the predicted Pit Lake water levels. However, the owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake throughout the operational phase of the Project. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. If the results indicate that the mechanism described in this question is taking place, the mine phasing and development plan could be adjusted to progressively advance towards the final downgradient face of the mine, thereby exposing a new surface on the downgradient face with each progressive phase.</p>
1068	291 - 5	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>4. Will the proponent's water filtration plant have the capacity to remove the fine suspended solids from the volume of subsurface water draining out of the McNab Valley that could pass through the final size of the pit/pond reservoir and if so how long will BURNCO maintain this filtration equipment?</p>	<p>Water will be used in the Processing Area to wash the fines from the aggregate material. This water will be recycled in two water storage tanks and re-used. There is no water filtration plant associated with the Proposed Project. Geotechnical analyses presented in Appendix 5.6-E of the EA found that fines are not expected to migrate with the groundwater from the pit into the downstream environment during operations. Direct surface connection between the pit lake and the receiving environment is not expected during operations; it will only be established at closure when the constructed offset habitat is connected to the pit lake. At that time, pit lake water will be monitored to confirm the prediction made in the assessment that pit lake water does not represent a deleterious substance and would be unlikely to cause pollution in the downstream receiving environment.</p>
1069	291 - 6	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>5. The Province of BC has recently changed its regulations regarding "Dam Structures". Will the proposed berm be built to these revised Dam Structure standards to ensure present and future stability, or will it simply be built up as an earthen berm.</p>	<p>The berm will be meet the required design standard to be confirmed with the Ministry of Energy and Mines at permitting. It is BURNCO's understanding that the containment berm will not be classified as a dam.</p>
1070	292 - 1	Roy Ramage	Squamish, BC	<p>I believe the gravel works plant team has done Their due diligence and there should be no reason Not to continue with the planned gravel pit As laid out</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1071	293 - 1	Rosemary Hart	North Vancouver, BC	Please not in my backyard! Howe Sound is recovering from copper leached for years from The Britannia Mine. The worst disaster in North America! All the sea life died, everything!	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1072	293 - 2	Rosemary Hart	North Vancouver, BC	Please not in my backyard! Howe Sound is recovering from copper leached for years from The Britannia Mine. The worst disaster in North America! All the sea life died, everything!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1073	294 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Why BC is allowing corporations to develop such energy intensive, environmentally destructive, economically unjustifiable projects to ruin the places people come to admire, play and enjoy?	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1074	294 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Is there any land in BC that is off limits, protected and preserved for the future generation?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1075	294 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Who should be hold accountable for turning BC into a devastated Third World barren ground with these insane projects?	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
1076	295 - 1	Nathaniel Berger	Vancouver, BC	The McNab creek area is a beautiful place. There should not be mines there, that would ruin it.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1077	296 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I love the ocean life that's coming back In recent years. Imagine what it become if we let it. 100 years from now no one will give a shot about a gravel mine but the marine life keeps the planet alive	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1078	297 - 1	Dr. K. L Funt	Horseshoe Bay, BC	My family lives directly on Howe Sound. I would like to express our very strong opposition to the McNab Creek Estuary proposal to start a gravel pit.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1079	297 - 2	Dr. K. L Funt	Horseshoe Bay, BC	Howe Sound is Vancouver's natural treasure. It is beyond beautiful and exceeds the fjords of Norway in tourist potential.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1080	297 - 3	Dr. K. L Funt	Horseshoe Bay, BC	B.C. and Canada should make it a National Park, not exploit it for short term natural resource extraction gain. This would be national insanity.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1081	298 - 1	Annalisa Fiteni	Squamish, BC	Nooooooll !!! Don't put more heavy machinery on our highway !!!! It's already so dangerous	A further source of aggregate material is required to ensure the reliability of supply. Securing alternate suppliers is not the preferred long-term option for BURNCO as there is too much uncertainty surrounding the ability to supply aggregate material during times of increased demand, in addition to the in ability to control the quality and price of material.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1082	299 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Please consider the damage to the health of our natural resources the Burnco Aggregate mine will cause. The McNab Creek Estuary is a sensitive area that sustains life for Salmon and a large variety of plant and animal species. Once the damage is done reversing it will not be easy.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1083	299 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Please consider the damage to the health of our natural resources the Burnco Aggregate mine will cause. The McNab Creek Estuary is a sensitive area that sustains life for Salmon and a large variety of plant and animal species. Once the damage is done reversing it will not be easy.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1084	299 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	There are abundant aggregate sites away from this sensitive area please use them.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1085	300 - 1	Gerald Cullen	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is still recovering after a very long period with industrial activity affecting the sound. Mining, pulp mills, and logging caused widespread pollution dating from the early 1900's. The recovery is still underway.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1086	300 - 2	Gerald Cullen	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is still recovering after a very long period with industrial activity affecting the sound. Mining, pulp mills, and logging caused widespread pollution dating from the early 1900's. The recovery is still underway.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1087	300 - 3	Gerald Cullen	Vancouver, BC	It is absolutely ridiculous that a huge step backwards would be taken to permit Burnco to operate a quarry in this estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1088	300 - 4	Gerald Cullen	Vancouver, BC	I'm against this gross intrusion of industrial activity into a key recreational area for minimal positive economic impact.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1089	300 - 5	Gerald Cullen	Vancouver, BC	I'm against this gross intrusion of industrial activity into a key recreational area for minimal positive economic impact.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1090	301 - 1	D Sage	Squamish, BC	Stop this from happening period.money,money money,I'm sick of it.save these special places!!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1091	302 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Burnco is a responsible proponent. I believe they can operate safely and protect the environment. I believe it's a good fit for McNab Creek and Howe Sound. BC needs jobs for the people and tax revenues- this provides both. I support the project for those reasons.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1092	303 - 1	Lynn Wilbur	North Vancouver, BC	We are going down the wrong road here. Howe Sound must be protected. National Park status is required. Vancouverites need wild places. Not another Burrard Inlet! !!	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1093	304 - 1	Emilie Montgomery	Lions Bay, BC	Today Sept 30 2016 we witnessed a Herd of wild elk in Howe Sound, at McNab Creek  our wildlife must be continually protected if we wish to have them around for future generations.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
1094	305 - 1	Ken Money	Squamish, BC	This should be stopped. We do not need this so close to the sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1095	306 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I oppose the Burnco mine proposal.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1096	307 - 1	John Phillips	Lions Bay, BC	This project must not proceed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1097	307 - 2	John Phillips	Lions Bay, BC	We have spent 20 years cleaning up Howe Sound. We are just starting to see the benefits of this work - more Orcas, Dolphins and Salmon coming in to feed on the new populations of herring and other small fish.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1098	307 - 3	John Phillips	Lions Bay, BC	There is an opportunity to turn Howe Sound into a UNESCO World Heritage site.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1099	307 - 4	John Phillips	Lions Bay, BC	This will have far greater economic benefits than any industrial activities.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1100	307 - 5	John Phillips	Lions Bay, BC	Future generations will judge us. Once an ecosystem is damaged it may not ever be recovered or it may take 10's or 100's of years. Please do not approve this project which is not wanted by anybody in the region. There is no social licence.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1101	308 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Victoria, BC	12 jobs are not worth it!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1102	308 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Victoria, BC	Stop Bunco Aggregate Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1103	308 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Victoria, BC	McNab Creek currently hosts bald eagles Eagle surveying for a meal , Roosevelt Elk , and an estuary flourishing with marine life . Burnco's consultants identified 23 species at risk that this mine would threaten.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1104	308 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Victoria, BC	McNab Creek currently hosts bald eagles Eagle surveying for a meal , Roosevelt Elk , and an estuary flourishing with marine life . Burnco's consultants identified 23 species at risk that this mine would threaten.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1105	308 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Victoria, BC	The Departments of Fisheries and Oceans expressed strong concern about the project's impact to fish and fish habitat, particularly chum and coho salmon.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1106	309 - 1	Donna Patrick	Gibsons, BC	I am not in favour of theirs mine. The environment will be ruined. There will be no more singleness in this channel. This is the wrong kind of industry for this area. . Do not allow this.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1107	310 - 1	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound is only now finally recovering from decades of environmental abuse.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1108	310 - 2	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel mine at McNabb Creek would renew the policy of sacrificing irreplaceable habitat for very minimal economic gain -- and whatever that gain might be, it would be more than eliminated if the operators of the mine were to fail to restore the area to its natural state after the mining operation. If the company were to go out of business, the province and its taxpayers would be left holding the bag.	Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Benefits of the Proposed Project include: - capital expenditures (\$21.5 million), - operational expenditures (\$13 million/year), - direct, indirect and induced employment, and - taxation revenue.  Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.  BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.  Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are: - Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses; - Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel; - New amphibian breeding habitat ; - Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1109	310 - 3	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel mine at McNabb Creek would renew the policy of sacrificing irreplaceable habitat for very minimal economic gain -- and whatever that gain might be, it would be more than eliminated if the operators of the mine were to fail to restore the area to its natural state after the mining operation. If the company were to go out of business, the province and its taxpayers would be left holding the bag.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
1110	310 - 4	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I strongly oppose the mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1111	310 - 5	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRDR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1112	310 - 6	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1113	310 - 7	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1114	310 - 8	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1115	310 - 9	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The only beneficiaries of this project would be the owners of the Burnco Corporation, not the local communities, not the wildlife, and not the province.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1116	310 - 10	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	Unless Burnco is willing to put up a bond of tens of millions of dollars to guarantee the restoration of the habitat, this project should not even receive consideration.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1117	310 - 11	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	And even if such a bond is offered, the disruption to the ecosystem, the noise and unsightliness of the site, along with the loss of value in tourism and filming location fees all speak to the undesirability of this project. Please do not grant it an approval.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1118	311 - 1	Ronald Ramsay	Shirley, BC	Salmon habitat at risk.It's a NO GO ZONE for resource extraction.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1119	312 - 1	James Dahmer	Squamish, BC	just stop it. we dont need this.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1120	313 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	please keep industry out of Howe Sound. The whales and dolphins have finally returned to this area after 40 years. We live and boat in this area weekly, and it should be preserved for recreation and tourism.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1121	313 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The whales and dolphins have finally returned to this area after 40 years.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1122	313 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The whales and dolphins have finally returned to this area after 40 years.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1123	313 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	We live and boat in this area weekly, and it should be preserved for recreation and tourism.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1124	314 - 1	Valerie Bernier	Squamish, BC	Please stop the gravel pit from establishing in McNab Creek area. It will destroy this very important and rich pristine ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1125	315 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am opposed to this development - like most people living in this area.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1126	315 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	YOU know its environmentally unsound s0 I wonder why you are going ahead	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1127	316 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	STOP the Burnco mine project. Keep our Howe Sound Healthy! Without our environment we will be nothing!!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1128	317 - 1	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>We are in the Cascadia subduction earthquake zone, scientists find there is an 85% chance of a major earthquake, BC Government states there is a 1 in 3 chance that a major earthquake will happen within the next 50 years</p> <p>The idea of a berm, built partially of the silt removed from washing of the gravel, along a portion of McNab Creek to the North, and a similar berm, built along the South section of the man made lake will face liquefaction and flooding in a major earthquake.</p> <p>There is a very serious concern about the whole estuary being wiped out should a mega earthquake hit. The man made berms will liquefy and flood across the estuary. This will smother all the small and very small marine life forms. We will see an adverse impact on species in the Sound for many years, as without the nutrient of the smaller marine life, the next level of fish will not survive.</p> <p>Has a recent geological engineering seismic study been done on the area?</p> <p>Has high energy seismic surveys in Federal waters been carried out recently?</p> <p>Do you have a seismic mediation strategy report or study?</p> <p>Will an earthquake warning device be placed at the project, if not, why?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project. The potential for damage or loss of proposed on-shore and marine facilities associated with the earthquake-related ground shaking, soil liquefaction-induced loss of strength and foundation support, lateral spreading movements and potential ground surface ruptures from faulting at depth have been considered in Volume 3, Part D, Section 14 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects of earthquakes on the project consider seismic events that might occur throughout the region including local events. Existing earthquake data are used to assess seismic hazard, including potential earthquakes associated with the Cascadia Subduction zone.</p> <p>The pit lake containment berm will be designed and built to appropriate design criteria, which include seismic stability considerations.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1129	318 - 1	Cheryle Dobbyn	Alberta	Dear Important Person: I live on the east side of the Rocky Mountains in Alberta. I'm old now, but I grew up in Saskatchewan...a true 'prairie kid'. For me, the West Coast is Canada's most beautiful gift. I love taking time to visit, embrace, and breathe in the beauty of our West Coast. For decades, I watched and listened as people fought to protect and restore Howe Sound. I rejoiced when The Sound began, and then has continued, to become a healthy, clean and vibrant living ocean again.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1130	318 - 2	Cheryle Dobbyn	Alberta	PLEASE, after all this work and blood and sweat and money and time and supreme effort....do not open up this old wound of noise, pollution, and dirty extraction for the almighty dollar. I would prefer to see almighty whales in Howe Sound...and perhaps a kayak or two or ten. Please.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
1131	318 - 3	Cheryle Dobbyn	Alberta	PLEASE, after all this work and blood and sweat and money and time and supreme effort....do not open up this old wound of noise, pollution, and dirty extraction for the almighty dollar. I would prefer to see almighty whales in Howe Sound...and perhaps a kayak or two or ten. Please.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1132	319 - 1	Leslie Stanick	Surrey, BC	Howe Sound is teeming with life, from salmon and herring, seals, orcas and humpback whales. Bird life including cormorants, eagles, gulls, herons and many other species make their home in this unique sound, filled with wildlife. Its a magical wildlife refuge.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1133	319 - 2	Leslie Stanick	Surrey, BC	So when I heard that the Burnco Aggregate Project, a gravel mine 100 football fields long, and as deep as a ten story building is being proposed on the sand flats, I had to protest.	At closure, the pit lake with be 600 m by 500 m, and approximately 35 metres deep.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1134	319 - 3	Leslie Stanick	Surrey, BC	The flats are a vital spawning ground for salmon which have only recently made a comeback after the devastating pollution of Howe Sound by 100 years of logging and mining. With the devastating lack of salmon this year, only 800,000 returning to spawn in the Fraser River, it would be crazy to destroy an estuary that is just coming back to life on these tidal flats.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1135	319 - 4	Leslie Stanick	Surrey, BC	The Burnco Mine project would be creating noise 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, destroying the peace of this beautiful region, causing distress to all the wildlife in the area. Don't destroy this unique and beautiful haven of tranquility for a gravel pit. Please protect this jewel for generations to come.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR D noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1136	319 - 5	Leslie Stanick	Surrey, BC	The Burnco Mine project would be creating noise 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, destroying the peace of this beautiful region, causing distress to all the wildlife in the area. Don't destroy this unique and beautiful haven of tranquility for a gravel pit. Please protect this jewel for generations to come.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1137	320 - 1	Denise Olson	Grantham's Landing, BC	I would like it noted publicly that I am AGAINST Burnco and affiliates proposed operation of gravel mining in McNab creek area in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1138	320 - 2	Denise Olson	Grantham's Landing, BC	My opposition is based on the obvious pollution of Howe Sound which will occur if this project is allowed to disturb a recovering ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1139	321 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	As a resident of Bowen Island in Howe sound for the past 16 , I have watched with great joy the Dolphins return, the salmon and herring , the whales etc. All a direct result of eliminating the industries in the Sound that inhibited that process in the past. It would be insane to contemplate a reversal by allowing the introduction of more polluting industries in Howe Sounds.Please reject this application!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1140	322 - 1	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco Gravel Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1141	322 - 2	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	Environmentally this project would be a disaster for one of the 3 only Estuaries in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1142	322 - 3	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>This project has been refused in the past due to concerns about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, in particular the Chum and Coho Salmon.</p> <p>It's only because of gutted environmental laws by the Harper Government that Bunco is back trying to get approval. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to 'strong arm' the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as "the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat".</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1143	322 - 4	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1144	322 - 5	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>The concerns for Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1145	322 - 6	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>b) DFO is very worried about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, particularly chum and coho salmon. The Vancouver Aquarium is concerned re the salmon, and re rockfish at the estuary mouth.</p> <p>c) The planned artificial salmon spawning channel would do nothing to compensate for the damage to fish and fish habitat in the McNab estuary.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1146	322 - 7	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>3. The effects of wet mining (digging the gravel out of water, where the estuary forest used to be): Burnco's argument that there won't be dust because they're mining "wet" is also misleading because the dust just becomes silt. The silt will kill the plant and animal life in the estuary.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>
1147	322 - 8	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1148	322 - 9	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1149	322 - 10	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1150	322 - 11	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1151	322 - 12	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1152	322 - 13	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	5. Would require SLRD to rezone this land, moving this land into industrial zoning forever.	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1153	322 - 14	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that there is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employ people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1154	322 - 15	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that there is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employ people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1155	322 - 16	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that there is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employ people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result in a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1156	322 - 17	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>For those that reside in the area, 17 local residents, and 30 recreational properties, they stand to lose a quality of life they have enjoyed for years.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussions are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1157	322 - 18	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	Burnco is not adding to the value of this area by their project. Howe Sound is a recreational playground that attracts tourism dollars because of the pristine nature it is in.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1158	322 - 19	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	This Calgary based company is the only recipient of gain. Their websites boast areas that they have remediated successfully. However, it must be noted that they have never remediated a pristine environment. Who would hold them accountable?	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1159	322 - 20	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	The idea that they will build a berm of soil along the part of the creek closest to the gravel extraction, sounds good until you think about the dust and runoff from the berm will wash into the creek, and damage fish and insect life there.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1160	322 - 21	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	It will probably also silt up/kill fragile ancient glass sponges nearby in the ocean.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1161	322 - 22	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	With what we know about the assets in Howe Sound from the David Suzuki project and the value of estuaries to the whole of Howe Sound, this project should not be provided with an EA certificate. We ask the BCEAO to reject this project.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1162	323 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Why, when we have seen Howe Sound come back by leaps and bounds (in terms of a healthy and sustainable environment for sea and land wildlife to once again flourish), would we even consider granting a company like BURNCO the chance to ruin the advances we have made to bring back such a vital ecosystem from human mistakes made in the past? I say no to steps backward and YES to continuing to champion the fish and other wildlife, AND also the human enjoyment, of a clean Howe Sound and McNab Creek estuary! BURNCO must not be allowed to ruin the years of work it has taken to get this sensitive ecological area back on its feet. Thank you.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1163	324 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	We all realize that [high] paying jobs in our corridor very important. The only problem here is that our salmon are being attacked ecologically from too many sources. Sorting out the salmon should be the first priority for our province. We must remember that salmon is the most important species in our province and we must do everything to protect them. Our province needs to start thinking more long term instead of doing what's good for us now. We need sustainable businesses and this can be done but we can't keep letting in these projects that are hurting our fish and our waters.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1164	324 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	We all realize that [high] paying jobs in our corridor very important. The only problem here is that our salmon are being attacked ecologically from too many sources. Sorting out the salmon should be the first priority for our province. We must remember that salmon is the most important species in our province and we must do everything to protect them. Our province needs to start thinking more long term instead of doing what's good for us now. We need sustainable businesses and this can be done but we can't keep letting in these projects that are hurting our fish and our waters.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1165	325 - 1	Tina Winterlik	Vancouver, BC	Please for the sake our children and children's children do not allow this to happen. Please watch the videos on this page  Help Save Howe Sound- Only 2 days left <a href="https://tinawinterlik.blogspot.ca/2016/10/help-save-howe-sound-only-2-days-left.html">https://tinawinterlik.blogspot.ca/2016/10/help-save-howe-sound-only-2-days-left.html</a>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1166	326 - 1	Jill Bingham Daniels	Squamish, BC	It would be irresponsible to add any more pressure to the ecosystem of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1167	326 - 2	Jill Bingham Daniels	Squamish, BC	Our planet is warming and the sea levels will rise.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.</p>
1168	326 - 3	Jill Bingham Daniels	Squamish, BC	Salmon need to be protected from any harm.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1169	326 - 4	Jill Bingham Daniels	Squamish, BC	The time has come to halt the wholesale destruction of our earth nearly for human greed.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1170	327 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	This would be irresponsible to allow.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1171	328 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Please do not build the Mcnab Creek gravel mine. I am deeply concerned about the ecological impacts on fish such as salmon who's spawning ground will be impacted, as well as species such as trout who frequent the Mcnab creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1172	328 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am also concerned about the impact on endangered species such as elk whose food sources would be impacted by the mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1173	328 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Finally, the potential environmental impacts of a mine in Howe Sound would stifle its' recovery from former pollution due to mining and pulp mills. I ask that you consider beyond the financial benefits and consider the long term environmental and ecological health of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1174	329 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco Aggregate mine project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1175	329 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The negative environmental impact on Howe Sound and the salmon run are too great a risk to justify this project.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1176	329 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The negative environmental impact on Howe Sound and the salmon run are too great a risk to justify this project.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1177	330 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	This project should not be permitted to proceed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1178	330 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound should be recognized as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1179	330 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	There is no place for an aggregate mine on the shores of this delicate ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1180	331 - 1	Michael Lundrigan	Squamish, BC	there is no need to choose this location really !!!the use of barges and boats to make gravel really people wake up has to be some place that doesn't involve howe sound or the ocean shore !! all the rock mountains and you have to pick a place next to the ocean and those big heavy trucks on a very busy part of the sea to sky highway !!!	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1181	331 - 2	Michael Lundrigan	Squamish, BC	there is no need to choose this location really !!!the use of barges and boats to make gravel really people wake up has to be some place that doesn't involve howe sound or the ocean shore !! all the rock mountains and you have to pick a place next to the ocean and those big heavy trucks on a very busy part of the sea to sky highway !!!	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1182	332 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	We need wild salmon and nature to thrive, not a gravel mine. No to this industrial site!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1183	333 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Marcy, Mike, Scott, and Will,</p> <p>Lady and gentlemen of Burnco.</p> <p>The pic attached was taken yesterday at McNab.</p> <p>In this message please know that I am one of a significant group of citizens who live in Lions Bay, Howe Sound. We also, because of where we live, enjoy Howe Sound. Every summer, all summer, we take our families over to McNab Creek and enjoy this pristine area. It's not just us though, it's many people who live in what we all refer to as the Sea to Sky Corridor.</p> <p>You would too if you lived here. You would also take your kids here, your kid's kids, and then they would begin the same cycle. The same, very positive cycle, of caring for this planet. Especially the places like McNab Creek.</p> <p>Because of where you live, I can't expect you to really understand this.</p> <p>When I read through all of your corporate history, one point stands out quite clearly. You care a lot about your family history.</p> <p>Well we all do too. And you would if you lived here, and experienced what we all do.</p> <p>No matter what you believe based on your studies, you will do</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1184	334 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>STOP. JUST STOP. NO. NO. NO Gravel pit, No heavy equipment, No tankers, No more destruction. No more death of our home, our animal friends, no more poison. No more greed/money/profit as the decision point on our futures. With all the information, statistics, reports and the strongly expressed sentiments of the people - wake up. Say No to death and Yes to Life.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1185	335 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	<p>please consider my objections to the proposed Burnco Project.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1186	335 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	I'm not convinced that the project is in the best interests of the Howe Sound environment and community.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1187	335 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	The previous Fisheries assessment stated that the MacNabe creek would be rendered uninhabitable to wild fish stocks if Burnco goes ahead and this will continue to be the case despite their claims otherwise. Don't sacrifice Howe Sound as an important resource.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1188	335 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	The noise and light pollution, increased tug and barge traffic and foreshore habitat destruction will erode the enjoyment of the sound recreationaly at a time when the potential for increased tourism and subsequent economic benefit could eventually far outweigh the 12 jobs created by such an environmentally destructive form of industry. Vancouver is so lucky to have such a world class marine Fjord and ecosystem capable of supporting a large and increasing number of fish, mammala and birds. Have you seen the Orca and Porpoises? It is only just now recovering from the last 100+ years of industrial activity and we can't just go backwards and start over.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1189	335 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	<p>The noise and light pollution, increased tug and barge traffic and foreshore habitat destruction will erode the enjoyment of the sound recreationally at a time when the potential for increased tourism and subsequent economic benefit could eventually far outweigh the 12 jobs created by such an environmentally destructive form of industry. Vancouver is so lucky to have such a world class marine Fjord and ecosystem capable of supporting a large and increasing number of fish, mammals and birds. Have you seen the Orca and Porpoises? It is only just now recovering from the last 100+ years of industrial activity and we can't just go backwards and start over.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1190	335 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	<p>The noise and light pollution, increased tug and barge traffic and foreshore habitat destruction will erode the enjoyment of the sound recreationally at a time when the potential for increased tourism and subsequent economic benefit could eventually far outweigh the 12 jobs created by such an environmentally destructive form of industry. Vancouver is so lucky to have such a world class marine Fjord and ecosystem capable of supporting a large and increasing number of fish, mammals and birds. Have you seen the Orca and Porpoises? It is only just now recovering from the last 100+ years of industrial activity and we can't just go backwards and start over.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1191	335 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	The noise and light pollution, increased tug and barge traffic and foreshore habitat destruction will erode the enjoyment of the sound recreationally at a time when the potential for increased tourism and subsequent economic benefit could eventually far outweigh the 12 jobs created by such an environmentally destructive form of industry. Vancouver is so lucky to have such a world class marine Fjord and ecosystem capable of supporting a large and increasing number of fish, mammala and birds. Have you seen the Orca and Porpoises? It is only just now recovering from the last 100+ years of industrial activity and we can't just go backwards and start over.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential changes in water, sediment and habitat quality from in-water works and propellor scour, and potential injury/mortality from in-water works, propellor scour and vessel strikes. Measures for mitigating potential effects from marine traffic on marine resources are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of potential residual effects on marine resources were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1192	335 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	The noise and light pollution, increased tug and barge traffic and foreshore habitat destruction will erode the enjoyment of the sound recreationally at a time when the potential for increased tourism and subsequent economic benefit could eventually far outweigh the 12 jobs created by such an environmentally destructive form of industry. Vancouver is so lucky to have such a world class marine Fjord and ecosystem capable of supporting a large and increasing number of fish, mammala and birds. Have you seen the Orca and Porpoises? It is only just now recovering from the last 100+ years of industrial activity and we can't just go backwards and start over.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1193	335 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	I'm pro industry. I work in industry and tourism I know the benefits of responsible sustainable recreation industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1194	335 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	This is just too small of an economic benefit to just a few people in the wrong place at the wrong time.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1195	336 - 1	Steve March	Gibsons, BC	Cristy Clark, how long must we fight to stop this project and to stop the industrialization of Howe Sound.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1196	336 - 2	Steve March	Gibsons, BC	This is a pristine area that we can be proud of. Howe Sound is a through fair for whales, porpoises, and other marine life.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1197	336 - 3	Steve March	Gibsons, BC	It is also a tourist magnet to enjoy the scenery and fishing possibilities.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1198	336 - 4	Steve March	Gibsons, BC	Please end this project. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vFzB1YSJcA4">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vFzB1YSJcA4</a>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1199	337 - 1	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	McNab Creek is an important fish spawning habitat in Howe sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1200	337 - 2	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel acts as a huge water sink which enables water in McNab creek to flow even during hot dry summers. This water flow is extremely important for all the organisms that live in and around McNab Creek. The value of keeping McNab Creek intact is more valuable than the value of the gravel.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1201	338 - 1	Bernadette	Lions Bay, BC	I am desperate if i hear that well educated (?) people and desicion makers are going to destroy Nature. Have you ever been to the Mc nab Creek? I dont think so because then You will think differently and wake up. Get out of the office and look around, you descision makers have to wake up!! You dont want to kill Nature instead of a couple of jobs. Lets be an example to all those nation and be the leader in say NO to killing Nature and Mc Nab Creek!!	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1202	339 - 1	Sharon Ann Smith	Brackendale, BC	I sincerely urge the Environmental Assessment offices of the provice of British Columbia and the Federal Government of Canada to NOT approve Burnco's application to opetate a gravel mine/quarry in the McNab Creek estuary of Howe Sound. The significant and devastating impacts on aquatic freshwater and oceanic life as well as the land based wildlife have been very well documented by many creditable sources including the Dept of Fisheries and Oceans.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1203	339 - 2	Sharon Ann Smith	Brackendale, BC	I sincerely urge the Environmental Assessment offices of the provice of British Columbia and the Federal Government of Canada to NOT approve Burnco's application to opetate a gravel mine/quarry in the McNab Creek estuary of Howe Sound. The significant and devastating impacts on aquatic freshwater and oceanic life as well as the land based wildlife have been very well documented by many creditable sources including the Dept of Fisheries and Oceans.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1204	339 - 3	Sharon Ann Smith	Brackendale, BC	The impact on our environmentally recovering Howe Sound must not be underestimated. Decades of hardwork by many stakeholders have produced the results we see all around us in our beautiful Howe Sound. I have lived and worked here for 27 years. I worked in the industrial sector for many years and saw firsthand the damage done. I have participated in the recovery and am committed to the restoration and maintenance of the Howe Sound ecosystem.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1205	339 - 4	Sharon Ann Smith	Brackendale, BC	This incredibly diverse area must be protected and preserved to sustain our wildlife and the health of our region. Please do not approve this project.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1206	340 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	As a resident of Squamish and a person who enjoys Howe Sound for its' natural beauty, marine life, wildlife, recreation and tourism, I strongly oppose the proposed gravel mine at the Mcnab Creek Estuary. Please consider these points as follows:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1207	340 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver's ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see "SuperNatural, British Columbia", how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1208	340 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1209	340 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1210	340 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1211	340 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1212	340 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1213	340 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1214	340 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1215	340 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1216	340 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1217	340 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1218	340 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1219	340 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1220	340 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1221	340 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1222	340 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Thank you for understanding that a giant gravel mine is not suitable for this precious ecosystem, and certainly not the best example of land and wildlife management especially given the low number of long term jobs it would provide.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1223	341 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I care about our salmon stocks, not gravel. This is a terrible idea.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1224	342 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our Family owns a cabin at mcNab creek. I spent my childhood fishing in the river and ocean, crabbing and pawning right where the proposed gravel mine would sit. This estuary would host elk, deer and bears (grizzly and black bear) which we would watch in their natural habitat.</p> <p>The estuary also hosts lots of shell fish (oysters, clams, mussels etc). All these species would lose their home if this project goes ahead</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1225	342 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Our Family owns a cabin at mcNab creek. I spent my childhood fishing in the river and ocean, crabbing and pawning right where the proposed gravel mine would sit. This estuary would host elk, deer and bears (grizzly and black bear) which we would watch in their natural habitat.</p> <p>The estuary also hosts lots of shell fish (oysters, clams, mussels etc). All these species would lose their home if this project goes ahead.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1226	342 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1227	343 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	My husband and I live in Lions Bay, which we think of as paradise. Living on the edge of Howe Sound is a privilege we do not take for granted.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1228	343 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	We understand that business is business and that Burnco needs a product to sell. However, we cannot understand why they have chosen McNab Creek as a place to be dug out for gravel.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1229	343 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	It is hard to believe that the company will only run for 16 years and only a few hours a day after the effort and cost to create the gravel pit. It seems that this is what Burnco says to gain approval. Then after a few months, it will be much easier for them to quietly ask the government to keep the pit going for decades and start running even 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1230	343 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	It is hard to believe that the company will only run for 16 years and only a few hours a day after the effort and cost to create the gravel pit. It seems that this is what Burnco says to gain approval. Then after a few months, it will be much easier for them to quietly ask the government to keep the pit going for decades and start running even 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1231	343 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The noise pollution alone will be an offence to anyone living in this amazing area. Simply put, sound travels so easily along waterways. Add in low marine cloud or fogs and the grating racket will become even more horrific. It is a fact that gravel pits are noisy; digging up rock is not a quiet pasttime. Anyone living near any gravel industry in the world will say the same thing.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
1232	343 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The noise pollution alone will be an offence to anyone living in this amazing area. Simply put, sound travels so easily along waterways. Add in low marine cloud or fogs and the grating racket will become even more horrific. It is a fact that gravel pits are noisy; digging up rock is not a quiet pasttime. Anyone living near any gravel industry in the world will say the same thing.	The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.
1233	344 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Burnco Products proposed large scale gravel mine at McNab Creek (a fjord and unique estuary) at the northern end of Howe Sound, 77 hectares, (over 200 football fields) including an onsite crushing and processing plant that will produce a minimum of one million tonnes per year for 20 years, run 24 hours a day, every day of the year and employ minimal jobs and be built by the company's own crews from outside B.C. in an "ecologically friendly manner" is absolutely unacceptable !	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1234	344 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	How on earth can you justify the need for this proposed mine.?	The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.  Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1235	344 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	There are already other existing gravel mines in the area that service Vancouver.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1236	344 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The aggregate production in no way validates the destruction of this salmon-bearing estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1237	344 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	12 or so jobs is not worth ithe ecological disruption and devastation to such a richly populated wildlife area including elk,, grizzly, wolves, black bears and plenty of other at-risk species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1238	344 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>12 or so jobs is not worth the ecological disruption and devastation to such a richly populated wildlife area including elk, grizzly, wolves, black bears and plenty of other at-risk species.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1239	344 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>You have the authority to say no. My husband is in the resource business and our family understands the industry. This plant does not make sense. Please use your common sense and do not allow this particular project to move ahead and find a new site that is less environmentally sensitive. Why does this government continue to bulldoze through projects like this that compromise the very ecosystem that we ultimately need to sustain life. This short sightedness is nothing less than negligence on the part of the governing bodies like yourselves that claim to be acting in the best interest of future generations. This project does not. The 5 members of our family ask that you deny this particular application.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1240	345 - 1	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	"We moved to Lions Bay 48 years ago when Howe Sound had been biologically dead as a result of being used as a dump site for the Britannia Mine and Woodfibre Pulp Mill. Both operations provided hundreds of jobs for workers, so it was considered an "acceptable trade off" for the loss of the environment and the fishing industry.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1241	345 - 2	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1242	345 - 3	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1243	345 - 4	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1244	345 - 5	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Is it now time to reverse the trend, by creating one or two dozens jobs at the expense of a much less invasive industry which supports hundreds of workers directly and indirectly?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1245	345 - 6	E. R. Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	I suggest this is NOT the correct way to go, as there are other suitable, less invasive gravel locations where the damage will be less evident.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1246	346 - 1	Jamie Woodall	Bowen Island, BC	As a resident of Bowen Island, and as a global citizen, I am greatly concerned about the obvious environmental damage which will occur as a result of the proposed McNab Creek gravel mine.	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1247	346 - 2	Jamie Woodall	Bowen Island, BC	This is a region which is an integral part of revival of the local ecosystems and the repopulation of many species at risk (salmon and elk).	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1248	346 - 3	Jamie Woodall	Bowen Island, BC	As a parent, and as the owner of a company which teaches young adults about sustainability and global citizenship, I feel strongly about the legacy we are leaving for the generations who will raise their own grandchildren here. Having lived in Indonesia for years, I have witnessed the devastating repercussions of poor land management and its effect on the local human and animal populations.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1249	346 - 4	Jamie Woodall	Bowen Island, BC	My family and I are firmly opposed to the development of this mine and ask that you prioritize the protection of the environment and the health and safety of the citizens who live here.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1250	347 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Being a 25 year resident of McNab Creek and having raised my 3 kids and now 3 grandchildren there, I would like to express my grave concern regarding the Burnco Aggregate Mine Proposal.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1251	347 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Hoping some of my fears would be alleviated by attending the Burnco Public Forum but unfortunately that proved to be unsuccessful. After talking to several Golder associates regarding the issues of pollution, noise, and wildlife it was clear to me that they could offer up studies of the area as it exists now but were very hesitant to commit to how it would be if this proposal goes through. When asking what the peak noise db levels during daily operation were as opposed to the average that they were displaying, I was told that he didn't know. I decided to look up Burnco's Sound Power Levels of Project Operation Equipment and could see some disturbingly high db levels associated to motors in crush plant(121.7) and falling gravel from Grizzly screen (120). During the construction phase Vibratory Hammers will run for hours kicking out 128.9 db which needless to say is extremely loud. Obviously this is the kind of information Burnco doesn't want to put on their informational posters.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1252	347 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>On every issue that Burnco is trying to address, the word mitigate is used. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines mitigate as "to make (something) less severe, harmful or painful". Those three words should never be used in connection with McNab Creek or the Howe Sound.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
1253	347 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I am having trouble understanding the risk to reward that this proposal offers. It is unconscionable that in today's day and age, we would consider risking the health of the McNab Creek Estuary ecosystem which is enjoyed by thousands for the financial benefit of a private few. Quite simply there will be no reward for the people living and enjoying this area and all it has to offer if Burnco comes in.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1254	347 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I am having trouble understanding the risk to reward that this proposal offers. It is unconscionable that in today's day and age, we would consider risking the health of the McNab Creek Estuary ecosystem which is enjoyed by thousands for the financial benefit of a private few. Quite simply there will be no reward for the people living and enjoying this area and all it has to offer if Burnco comes in.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1255	347 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Please do not let the power of Burnco's money enable them to bully their way through this application process. As you can see from all the other public comments, there are way too many concerns that have not been properly met.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1256	348 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	No no no major eye sore and the poor fish and water habitat	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1257	348 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	No no no major eye sore and the poor fish and water habitat	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1258	349 - 1	Teija Kovanen	Bowen Island, BC	I believe that an estuary is an incredibly sensitive area to convert into a gravel mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1259	349 - 2	Teija Kovanen	Bowen Island, BC	This project would displace/destroy diverse coastal wildlife and negatively impact the Howe Sound in numerous ways.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1260	349 - 3	Teija Kovanen	Bowen Island, BC	This project would displace/destroy diverse coastal wildlife and negatively impact the Howe Sound in numerous ways.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1261	349 - 4	Teija Kovanen	Bowen Island, BC	This project would displace/destroy diverse coastal wildlife and negatively impact the Howe Sound in numerous ways.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1262	349 - 5	Teija Kovanen	Bowen Island, BC	I think it is important to stop the Burnco development and instead consider using another less sensitive area.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1263	350 - 1	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	The following list summarizes my concerns. I think these issues need to be addressed seriously before this project proceeds.	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1264	350 - 2	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	1. The gravel quarry would be hard on 21 species officially at risk - including Coastal Cutthroat Trout, and Roosevelt elk, which were re-introduced some years ago and are valued by hunters.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1265	350 - 3	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1266	350 - 4	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1267	350 - 5	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1268	350 - 6	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>b) DFO is very worried about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, particularly chum and coho salmon. The Vancouver Aquarium is concerned re the salmon, and re rockfish at the estuary mouth.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1269	350 - 7	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	c) The planned artificial salmon spawning channel would do nothing to compensate for the damage to fish and fish habitat in the McNab estuary.	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m<sup>2</sup> of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
1270	350 - 8	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	3. The effects of wet mining (digging the gravel out of water, where the estuary forest used to be): Burnco's argument that there won't be dust because they're mining "wet" is also misleading because the dust just becomes silt. The silt will kill the plant and animal life in the estuary.	Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1271	350 - 9	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1272	350 - 10	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1273	350 - 11	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1274	350 - 12	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1275	350 - 13	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1276	350 - 14	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1277	350 - 15	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1278	350 - 16	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	Compare the benefits of this project: Profits for Burnco, and 12 full time jobs - to the above described serious harm of this project would cause.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1279	351 - 1	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel deposits act like a huge sponge storing water in the spring and releasing it the hot dry summer months. This water is estential for the eco system of McNab creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1280	351 - 2	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel deposits act like a huge sponge storing water in the spring and releasing it the hot dry summer months. This water is essential for the eco system of McNab creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1281	351 - 3	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel mining can not be allowed to happen there.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1282	351 - 4	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	There are no mitigating actions that could replace the loss of the gravel.	<p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project.</p>
1283	352 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound should be permanently closed to any type of industrial development.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1284	352 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Anyone who has ever remotely explored this area knows it's fragile beauty and the enormous gift we have to enjoy right at our fingertips. If you have ever been to Texada island, there is a great example of what the surrounding area ends up like. NOT PRETTY.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1285	352 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Not to mention the impact on the wildlife, whom will imminently be displaced from this area that is highly valuable to their existence. I say NO! Howe Sound is too valuable !	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1286	352 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Not to mention the impact on the wildlife, whom will imminently be displaced from this area that is highly valuable to their existence. I say NO! Howe Sound is too valuable !	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1287	353 - 1	Gregory Pollard	Bowen Island, BC	After viewing Bob Turners I think it complete insanity to build a gravel mine in Howe Sound,,, Anywhere ! Save Howe Sound !!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1288	354 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Burnco if allowed to extract and use this property should return that parcel back to the crown or create a park when they are finished rather than selling it off to some developer or commercial project like LNG. There is practically no public access to land in Howe sound and mcNabb access should be protected for the public who use it and the animals that live there.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. A marine-access campsite or park is not contemplated for the site which is located on privately-held land.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1289	355 - 1	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	We are writing this letter to express our strong opposition to the Alberta/Texas aggregate company BURNCO's application to construct and operate an open pit sand/ gravel mine and crushing facility proposed in the estuary on the productive fish/salmon bearing McNab Creek on the northwest shore of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1290	355 - 2	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	As very long time residents of Howe Sound, we are extremely concerned about the severely adverse impact such a project will have on McNab Creek and the overall health of Howe Sound's marine ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1291	355 - 3	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1292	355 - 4	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1293	355 - 5	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1294	355 - 6	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	As you are aware, after decades of industrial abuse making Howe Sound North America's most toxic mining waste site, about \$45 million of our tax payers dollars were spent cleaning up the Sound. Living on the shores of Howe Sound for almost 30 years, we have been delighted to see this investment of our tax dollars pay off with recovering fish populations and the concomitant recovery of sea mammal populations. While almost never seen in the first 15 to 20 years here, now almost weekly for the past decade we see cetaceans feeding. For example, last week we saw two rare false killer whales heading up Howe Sound. And a few days later we saw a vast, dense school of anchovies swimming along the shoreline. The size of this school was astonishing -- stretching over 220 feet in length, 50 feet wide and two to three feet depth. It's these rebounding stocks that are sustaining Howe Sound's recovering humpbacks and a myriad of other species.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1295	355 - 7	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO's own consultants have identified 21 species that are on the Species at Risk list that will be negatively impacted by this proposed open pit gravel mine in McNab Estuary.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1296	355 - 8	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>In this age of rapid species disappearance and extinction across Canada and around our planet, can you imagine a more heartening and positive environmental story than the 'Great Howe Sound Recovery' and just 20 kilometers from Canada's the third largest city. For once, a positive story and in the backdoor 'play ground' to be enjoyed by Vancouver's 2.5 million people. Breath-taking!</p> <p>However, as we also witness daily, this recovery is still extremely fragile. Howe Sound remains largely unprotected and with no long term land use plan. Caught between many different political jurisdictions and impacted by rapidly rising ocean temperatures and acidification, the fragile ecosystem of Howe Sound remains at risk; with highly unusual and unprecedented marine occurrences like starfish wasting disease that continues to cause mysterious and dramatic die-offs along the Pacific coast from Mexico to Alaska including Howe Sound. Dr. Martin Haulena, veterinarian for the Vancouver Aquarium recently said, "This (wasting disease) is, if not THE, certainly one of the biggest wildlife die-offs that have ever been recorded, and we're not just talking marine die-offs." The summer of 2016 also saw a highly unusual and unprecedented explosion of phytoplankton causing the waters of Howe Sound (and Georgia Strait) to turn bright, almost florescent green. While the causes of these alarming phenomenon are still be investigated, scientists agree on the scale of the problem and say evidence points to rising ocean acidification.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1297	355 - 9	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1298	355 - 10	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1299	355 - 11	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1300	355 - 12	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The economic benefits to BURNCO are evident, but the potentially negative economic impacts to other sectors are significant.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1301	355 - 13	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>It will damage BC's multi-billion dollar tourism industry, as well as having a negative impact on the recreational and commercial fishers, tourism operators, boaters, resident and recreational property owners and numerous children's camps with, literally thousands of campers each year that currently enjoy Howe Sound's ecosystem. There is a great potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that could accrue to the local economy. The area is used extensively by the movie and TV production sector for filming. Reindustrialization would put this at risk and, as taxpayers and residents, we are absolutely not prepared to take this risk.</p> <p>SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS: 1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver's ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see "SuperNatural, British Columbia", how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1302	355 - 14	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1303	355 - 15	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1304	355 - 16	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1305	355 - 17	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1306	355 - 18	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1307	355 - 19	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1308	355 - 20	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1309	355 - 21	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco’s own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1310	355 - 22	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1311	355 - 23	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1312	355 - 24	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1313	355 - 25	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1314	355 - 26	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1315	355 - 27	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine absolutely will not add to the beauty of the area but only severely detract.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1316	355 - 28	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The local residents of this area (and beyond) are committed to preserve the marine ecological viability and sustainability of our treasured Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1317	355 - 29	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	However, at this point, and for very justifiable reasons, we are extremely sceptical and disillusioned by the provincial and federal environmental review processes being applied provincially and federally. The environmental review process for another potentially hugely damaging re-industrialization project in Howe Sound, Woodfibre LNG, was the first to be approved after the 2015 election of the Trudeau Liberal government. Despite the new government's promises to revamp this process before putting such projects to the test, they used the extant, deeply flawed Harper Government environmental review process and gave the project the go-ahead. We, the public were not heard, thus giving democracy in our country a very black eye.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1318	355 - 30	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The scientific research done (by the proponents themselves) for that project was deeply flawed as was the assessment of the actual fisheries values of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare and environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>
1319	355 - 31	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	Also the public comments received for that project were the highest number of public submissions for any project in the history of Canada and over 94% of these submissions were opposed to the project. Absolutely no social license was granted for that industrial project for Howe Sound by the vast majority of the 12,000 residents who live here, exposing a ugly tear in our democratic process.	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project life has been reduced from 20-30 years to 16 years, and the maximum depth of excavation has been reduced from 55 metres to 35 metres;</li> <li>- There are no proposed discharges to, or withdrawals from, McNab Creek;</li> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Reduced the size of the pit lake as the northern edge has been moved away from the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke.</li> <li>- Pit lake designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. The elevation of the pit lake will also be used to manage base flows in the natural groundwater watercourses below the pit lake.</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Areas progressively reclaimed during the operational phase will be re-vegetated to control erosion.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> <li>- Replaced wash water sedimentation ponds and associated discharges with a 95% efficient wash plant that uses recycled water from two large storage tanks. The 5% loss (via retention, evaporation and absorption) will be supplemented with make-up water from a ground water well. No wash water will be discharged.</li> <li>- Fines generated from the crushing, screening, washing of material will be extracted from the wash water and mechanically dried and compressed into sediment cakes which will be used in progressive reclamation of the onsite fines disposal area.</li> <li>- Covered or enclosed Project components and/or operating under wet conditions (e.g., fine water spray) to reduced potential</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1320	355 - 32	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	This project has previously been turned down twice for consideration by the Province of BC.	Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.  Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.
1321	355 - 33	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	And now with threats from climate change and its impact upon our ecosystem, it's even less appropriate and justifiable.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.  Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.
1322	355 - 34	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	For this reason we are requesting that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the BC Environmental Assessment office fulfill their mandate as true environmental assessors and turn down this unacceptable open pit gravel mine proposal for McNab Creek, Howe Sound. A NO decision will go a long way to restoring our faith in the review process and our government agencies. Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1323	356 - 1	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	As a property owner in Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco mining project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1324	356 - 2	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<p>McNab Creek Estuary provides nutrient rich stream waters that fertilize the ocean and create rich and productive ecologies. It is a delicate ecosystem still recovering from past logging. Approval of the Burnco proposal will return the area to an industrial zone.</p> <p>Despite Burnco's proposed mitigation measures, damage to this recovering ecosystem will be unavoidable.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1325	356 - 3	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Environmental Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to salmon, herring and other marine life</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1326	356 - 4	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from gravel crushing affecting wild life</li> </ul>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1327	356 - 5	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption to the elk, an at risk species</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1328	356 - 6	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting during construction and operation causing further disruption to life in the area</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1329	356 - 7	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compromised air quality due to emissions</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1330	356 - 8	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased barge traffic in Howe Sound</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1331	356 - 9	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall damage to the estuary and surrounding area that comes with industrial development</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1332	356 - 10	Julia Watson	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Howe Sound has been returning to its natural beauty, creating tourism, recreational opportunities and vibrant communities. We have seen the return of dolphins and whales, indicators of ecological recovery. The Burnco Aggregate Project does not fit our values. Please say no to this project and preserve the delicate ecosystem of Howe Sound and its diverse local economies.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1333	357 - 1	J. L. R. Hughes	West Vancouver, BC	With due negotiation on measures to minimize local impact on recreational activities this historic quarry should be allowed to proceed. Howe Sound is not a residential suburb or Provincial Park. I am a recreational boater on our coast and particularly Howe Sound since 1940, a yacht club member for 52 years (now 88 years old) and still boating in Howe Sound, where there still is considerable industrial activity, merchant ships and ferries. Economic production of quarry rock where it occurs is important to our free enterprise construction industry. It is very evident that many kayaks and even standup boards are common in Howe Sound and are not daunted by the variety of other traffic. The yacht clubs across from the quarry are naturally particularly unhappy about the proposal, and maximum mitigation should be applied. Apart from that, there are not a large number of residents and cottages on the Howe Sound islands. There is an authorized logging operation proceeding on Gambier Island not far from the subject quarry.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1334	358 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I think it's a horrible idea that Burnco wants to build a gravel pit on one of the last estuaries around and it will effect animals, surrounding cabins and docks in the area with loud noises and barges coming in and out.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1335	358 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I think it's a horrible idea that Burnco wants to build a gravel pit on one of the last estuaries around and it will effect animals, surrounding cabins and docks in the area with loud noises and barges coming in and out.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1336	358 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I think it's a horrible idea that Burnco wants to build a gravel pit on one of the last estuaries around and it will effect animals, surrounding cabins and docks in the area with loud noises and barges coming in and out.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1337	358 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I think it's a horrible idea that Burnco wants to build a gravel pit on one of the last estuaries around and it will effect animals, surrounding cabins and docks in the area with loud noises and barges coming in and out.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1338	358 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Not to mention the salmon run in the creek will be disrupted and potentially destroyed.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1339	358 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This area is enjoyed by many, go extend a current gravel pit if need be, do not create one on this beautiful land for really no reason.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1340	358 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This area is enjoyed by many, go extend a current gravel pit if need be, do not create one on this beautiful land for really no reason.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1341	358 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This area is enjoyed by many, go extend a current gravel pit if need be, do not create one on this beautiful land for really no reason.	A further source of aggregate material is required to ensure the reliability of supply. Securing alternate suppliers is not the preferred long-term option for BURNCO as there is too much uncertainty surrounding the ability to supply aggregate material during times of increased demand, in addition to the inability to control the quality and price of material.
1342	359 - 1	Stephen Zimmerman	McNab Creek, BC	Noise and Vibration study completely voids peak volume readings. Peak volume readings are very important in an environment assessment, As someone who is neighboring the project, What exactly I am going to be listening too?. Peak volumes should be available in an environmental assessment of this scale.	In the absence of formal guidance, the environmental noise from the Project was assessed in accordance with noise regulations specified by the BC Oil and Gas Commission in the document British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline, by Health Canada in Useful Information for Environmental Assessments, and in the SCR D's Noise Control Bylaw. These guidelines do not provide noise limits for peak sound levels. Energy equivalent noise level (Leq) measurements and noise limits include all of the acoustic energy including any noise peaks.
1343	360 - 1	Glenda Swards	Gibsons, BC	Please don't approve BURNCO Rock Products application to build a large scale open pit gravel mine in the McNab Creek Valley in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1344	360 - 2	Glenda Swards	Gibsons, BC	There has already been widespread opposition to this project and we don't understand how they can apply again when they have already been turned down.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1345	360 - 3	Glenda Swards	Gibsons, BC	A large scale open pit gravel mine will threaten the McNab Creek estuary which is vital habitat for salmon and other species at risk. Please deny their request.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1346	360 - 4	Glenda Swards	Gibsons, BC	A large scale open pit gravel mine will threaten the McNab Creek estuary which is vital habitat for salmon and other species at risk. Please deny their request.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1347	361 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I do not want to see this kind of damaging industry in this beautiful natural area. We are finally beginning to see significant recovery of important habitat and species here and this is another ill considered proposal that will hurt, not help in this recovery.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1348	362 - 1	Shas Cho	Boston Bar, BC	The time has come to stop raping the earth for profits and to protect our land, water, air and animals. Let's celebrate our pristine creeks and rivers rather than selling them to the greediest bidder. Please DENY this application. Thank you.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1349	363 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Hazelton, BC	Salmon habitat is crucial to our needs.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1350	363 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Hazelton, BC	There are other places to get gravel that do not cause as much disaster.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1351	363 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Hazelton, BC	There are other places to get gravel that do not cause as much disaster.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.
1352	364 - 1	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	I am strongly against the proposal to site a gravel mine on Howe Sound	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1353	365 - 1	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound is the "jewel in the crown" of Pacific North-West fjords and inlets, an area of outstanding natural beauty, and remarkably accessible to lower mainland residents and visitors. Boaters, kayakers, cruise ships, hikers, climbers and shoreline tourists all gain tremendous value and satisfaction from this glorious Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1354	365 - 2	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	Yet this precious asset has been deplorably and wilfully neglected by Provincial, Federal and Municipal Governments for decades. Almost anywhere else in the developed world there would be a master plan and strong protections in place to preserve such an outstanding natural asset for future generations, particularly given its proximity to the lower mainland. However, instead, we have Provincial and Federal governments that seriously consider it appropriate to site new LNG plants and gravel pits on its shores.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1355	365 - 3	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	They commendably and expensively clean up Britannia Mine, then soon after start considering new sources of visual ugliness, pollution & noise. Its as if our governments live on another planet, and that Beautiful British Columbia is just an electioneering slogan, and they have no idea what Howe Sound is all about, how outstandingly beautiful it is, and how many hundreds of thousands of people it benefits every year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1356	365 - 4	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	They commendably and expensively clean up Britannia Mine, then soon after start considering new sources of visual ugliness, pollution & noise. Its as if our governments live on another planet, and that Beautiful British Columbia is just an electioneering slogan, and they have no idea what Howe Sound is all about, how outstandingly beautiful it is, and how many hundreds of thousands of people it benefits every year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1357	365 - 5	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	They commendably and expensively clean up Britannia Mine, then soon after start considering new sources of visual ugliness, pollution & noise. Its as if our governments live on another planet, and that Beautiful British Columbia is just an electioneering slogan, and they have no idea what Howe Sound is all about, how outstandingly beautiful it is, and how many hundreds of thousands of people it benefits every year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1358	365 - 6	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	They commendably and expensively clean up Britannia Mine, then soon after start considering new sources of visual ugliness, pollution & noise. Its as if our governments live on another planet, and that Beautiful British Columbia is just an electioneering slogan, and they have no idea what Howe Sound is all about, how outstandingly beautiful it is, and how many hundreds of thousands of people it benefits every year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1359	365 - 7	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	I am strongly against the Burnco gravel mine proposal. Every summer, I spend significant and precious time boating in the area between McNab Creek and Anvil Island, primarily because of its great beauty and total peacefulness. It is rare to find a completely silent beautiful place so close to Vancouver. The Burnco mine would destroy this precious area, with its mining noise, pollution and visual ugliness.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1360	365 - 8	Paul Akerhielm	Lions Bay, BC	Considerable progress has been made in cleaning up the air and water of Howe Sound over the past 40 years I have known it. A great deal of money and effort has been expended, and the results are impressive. It would be a tragedy and dereliction of responsibility to future generations to resume the industrialisation of Howe Sound.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1361	366 - 1	Justin Finn	North Vancouver, BC	Please do not allow Burnco to proceed with this project in any way.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1362	366 - 2	Justin Finn	North Vancouver, BC	The destruction of salmon and marine riparian habitat is a major issue.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1363	366 - 3	Justin Finn	North Vancouver, BC	Noise and greenfield development issues, as well as a lack of situation the development within a greater development framework for Howe Sound are further reasons to not approve the project	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1364	366 - 4	Justin Finn	North Vancouver, BC	Noise and greenfield development issues, as well as a lack of situation the development within a greater development framework for Howe Sound are further reasons to not approve the project	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1365	367 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound should never get industrialized again. How can a proposal like this one even be on the table. Why do we need to invest our time again and again to tell this government that Howe Sound should be protected.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
1366	367 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver’s ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see “SuperNatural, British Columbia”, how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1367	367 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1368	367 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1369	367 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1370	367 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1371	367 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1372	367 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1373	367 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1374	367 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco’s own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1375	367 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1376	367 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1377	367 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1378	367 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1379	367 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1380	367 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1381	367 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	How can you help?  Howe Sound needs to be protected for the enjoyment of both current and future generations so we are asking you to be an ambassador for Howe Sound in telling the government that you support the recovery of Howe Sound.  Let's be smart and think of ways how to protect this place and not re-industrialize it again.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1382	368 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	if the risks can be mitigated, then I am in favour, if it creates jobs for local people.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1383	369 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	A regional demand for additional aggregate has not been demonstrated.  The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel and aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.  A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See: <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a>	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1384	370 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Loss of productive salmon habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1385	370 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries and Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1386	370 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser River and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised. The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1387	371 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	No! We just started getting the whales back and rehabilitating the marine populations in Howe Sound!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1388	372 - 1	Yuko Godoy-Toku	Lions Bay, BC	Please save the beautiful Howe sound. It is for all our future.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1389	373 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Loss of both salmon and protected rock fish habitat.  Vancouver Aquarium VP Jeff Marliave confirmed in a 2014 interview with Larry Pynn that the McNab Creek estuary is relatively pristine. There are unmapped creeks with coho salmon in the McNab Valley that gravel extraction will kill. There are lots of rockfish that live at the dropoff right off the estuary. The rock fish habitat would be damaged by this operation.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1390	373 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Loss of both salmon and protected rock fish habitat.  Vancouver Aquarium VP Jeff Marliave confirmed in a 2014 interview with Larry Pynn that the McNab Creek estuary is relatively pristine. There are unmapped creeks with coho salmon in the McNab Valley that gravel extraction will kill. There are lots of rockfish that live at the dropoff right off the estuary. The rock fish habitat would be damaged by this operation.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyer) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1391	373 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>From reading the mitigation for salmon proposed by Burnco, it's obvious that much more salmon habitat would be eliminated than would be created....and the new salmon habitat might not work. There is no mention of mitigation for rock fish habitat.</p> <p>Use the precautionary principle well, and reject this proposal.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
1392	373 - 4	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Use the precautionary principle well, and reject this proposal.</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1393	374 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Unsuitable location.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1394	374 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1395	374 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1396	374 - 4	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1397	374 - 5	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1398	374 - 6	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m<sup>2</sup> of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1399	375 - 1	Jim Whitworth	Ucluelet, BC	Yes, It's a great idea to trash the environment, to make money for the big corporations. I mean what's more important clean water, air you breathe and land that sustains life or a stinking big pile of money for the ever greedy wealthy? I guess that question has been answered by the actions of the current government. Big money, at least in B.C. aces the environment every time.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1400	376 - 1	Davina Dube	Vancouver, BC	I am concerned with the wildlife, and fish habitat that Burnco Aggregate will be destroying if this project goes along. Not to mention the Salmon spawning habitat up the McNab Creek. We need to protect all of our Salmon habitat that we have left. It is critical that we protect the Howe Sound. With the millions of dollars invested in the clean up of Howe Sound and the reestablishment of an elk herd in the area it would seem to be a waste of tax payer money to just go destroy it all over again.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1401	376 - 2	Davina Dube	Vancouver, BC	I am concerned with the wildlife, and fish habitat that Burnco Aggregate will be destroying if this project goes along. Not to mention the Salmon spawning habitat up the McNab Creek. We need to protect all of our Salmon habitat that we have left. It is critical that we protect the Howe Sound. With the millions of dollars invested in the clean up of Howe Sound and the reestablishment of an elk herd in the area it would seem to be a waste of tax payer money to just go destroy it all over again.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1402	376 - 3	Davina Dube	Vancouver, BC	I am concerned with the wildlife, and fish habitat that Burnco Aggregate will be destroying if this project goes along. Not to mention the Salmon spawning habitat up the McNab Creek. We need to protect all of our Salmon habitat that we have left. It is critical that we protect the Howe Sound. With the millions of dollars invested in the clean up of Howe Sound and the reestablishment of an elk herd in the area it would seem to be a waste of tax payer money to just go destroy it all over again.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1403	376 - 4	Davina Dube	Vancouver, BC	The estuary and Howe Sound bring millions of tourist in the region every year. It is not worth losing that and destroying prime habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1404	377 - 1	Annie	Bowen Island, BC	Stop the gravel mine please 🙏	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1405	378 - 1	Diane Hofler	Halfmoon Bay, BC	Please don't allow the building of a gravel pit in this pristine area. I see the big freighters coming and going in the Sechelt area.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1406	378 - 2	Diane Hofler	Halfmoon Bay, BC	Not what our tourist dollars want to look at. Tourist come for the beauty of our province. We can accept the freighters in Vancouver Harbour not Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1407	379 - 1	Janey Cruise	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound is now a pristine waterway again thanks to all the environmental protection that has happened Today I saw a little school of dolphins in Collingwood Channel. The killer whales are back. The herring are back. Salmon is back. NO OPEN PIT mining anywhere near Howe Sound....	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1408	379 - 2	Janey Cruise	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound is now a pristine waterway again thanks to all the environmental protection that has happened Today I saw a little school of dolphins in Collingwood Channel. The killer whales are back. The herring are back. Salmon is back. NO OPEN PIT mining anywhere near Howe Sound....	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1409	380 - 1	John Dudley	Lions Bay, BC	<p>After years of pollution caused by the Britannia mine and pulp mill at Woodfibre Howe Sound is starting to recover and marine and bird life are returning.</p> <p>It would be madness to allow any more re-industrialization of the Sound and along with the proposed LNG plant at Woodfibre destroys our governments credibility for being at all concerned about our environment.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1410	381 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout, and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring for the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establish accurate baselines. At least 5 years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (ie SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-arranged norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
1411	382 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>After a review of the proponents project documents I am concerned that the project will have significant impact on a productive estuary and only result in a few local jobs.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1412	382 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	After a review of the proponents project documents I am concerned that the project will have significant impact on a productive estuary and only result in a few local jobs.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1413	382 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The McNabb Creek area is a key eco-system for juvenile salmon, herring and wintering migratory birds. There is very little riparian or foreshore buffer planned.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1414	382 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The extraction of gravel will affect groundwater flows into and out of the creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1415	382 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The potential for damage to the estuary by silt, noise and foreshore activities (oil, fuel or hydraulic fluid spills, light pollution, vibration) is significant.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1416	382 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The project will have large and irreversible impacts on residents and recreational use of Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1417	382 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The loss of residents property values is a significant moral issue for the proponents.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1418	382 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	There is no discussion of what will happen to the sediment load in the mined out pit when the creek berm is overwhelmed by storm flows. These will be deposited over the eel grass beds, smothering the estuary.	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1419	382 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The addition of site lighting will spoil the only area of dark night skies readily accessible from Metro Vancouver (Porteau Cove Park).	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1420	382 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Is the loss of the natural amenities of the area worth a few more dollars for the family interests that own Burnco?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1421	383 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>21 species are officially at risk from Burnco</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk, re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1422	383 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1423	384 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Please do not destroy the beautiful Howe Sound. It is crazy to be thinking of developing such a massive project. Our environment is our treasure for the future. Enjoy and promote our natural beauty instead of destroying it for the sake of off shore dollars.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1424	385 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty if the gravel quarry is built?  As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creek into the resulting huge pit (100 football fields wide and 10 stories deep). This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon, as well as plants that live in the estuary.  Have thorough hydro-logical studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg SCRDC) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds pre-agreed norms.	The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.
1425	386 - 1	Tim Agg	Vancouver, BC	After many years, I recently had the opportunity to revisit this area of Howe Sound. I've read and share the environmental concerns that have been expressed by several organizations. I can see no pressing economic reason that should prevail over environmental and aesthetic concerns.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1426	386 - 2	Tim Agg	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound and its few rivers need to be returned to their original richness of habitat for land animals and fish; and to be saved primarily for recreational purposes.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1427	386 - 3	Tim Agg	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound and its few rivers need to be returned to their original richness of habitat for land animals and fish; and to be saved primarily for recreational purposes.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1428	386 - 4	Tim Agg	Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound and its few rivers need to be returned to their original richness of habitat for land animals and fish; and to be saved primarily for recreational purposes.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1429	387 - 1	Kelly Heilig	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is in recovery. The herring are back and therefore so are many other species. This is a huge gravel mine that can have a serious impact on this ecosystem. When will we put our country first and value the natural environment over industry? The size of the mine is ridiculous.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1430	387 - 2	Kelly Heilig	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is in recovery. The herring are back and therefore so are many other species. This is a huge gravel mine that can have a serious impact on this ecosystem. When will we put our country first and value the natural environment over industry? The size of the mine is ridiculous.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1431	387 - 3	Kelly Heilig	Squamish, BC	Have Burnco find another site away from the water!	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
1432	387 - 4	Kelly Heilig	Squamish, BC	Have Burnco find another site away from the water!	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1433	388 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	As a longtime resident of Howe Sound the Burnco Aggregate Project is a very bad idea.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1434	389 - 1	Samantha Taylor	Lions Bay, BC	It would be ridiculous to build a large scale open pit gravel mine in the McNab Creek Valley in Howe Sound, especially considering widespread opposition. This threatens the McNab Creek estuary which is vital habitat for salmon and other species at risk. Stop threatening my home!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1435	389 - 2	Samantha Taylor	Lions Bay, BC	It would be ridiculous to build a large scale open pit gravel mine in the McNab Creek Valley in Howe Sound, especially considering widespread opposition. This threatens the McNab Creek estuary which is vital habitat for salmon and other species at risk. Stop threatening my home!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1436	390 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to this project due to the negative effect it will have on the eco system of the Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1437	391 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	Please do not approve the BURNCO gravel mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1438	391 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	We need our water and our fish, and this mine would put them in danger.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1439	391 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	We need our water and our fish, and this mine would put them in danger.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1440	392 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	I am opposed to this!! Leave the beauty of the Howe Sound intact!!!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1441	393 - 1	Linda	Squamish, BC	We have just moved to Howe Sound area. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world and big companies like you and governments just want blow everything up and kill the wildlife and forests. Leave it alone or Earh will no longer be here for you kids on grandkids..etc.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1442	394 - 1	Jane Hambrook	Vancouver, BC	What is the matter with people's thinking. When are you all going to listen to what's happening to our world's environments. We need to put an end to scraping up mountains and their estuaries and their watersheds and their natural mechanisms. There are other alternatives even if they take longer or cost more.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1443	394 - 2	Jane Hambrook	Vancouver, BC	What the Burnco Aggregate Project destroys now for and equitable cost will be paid for by the environment forever. Can you all not read the environmental information available, can you all not comprehend what you have learnt about environments, can you all live with knowing that you're cheating the future and actually killing things we don't even understand yet? To date WE ONLY HAVE ONE PLANET,that's it, just one.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
1444	394 - 3	Jane Hambrook	Vancouver, BC	Would love to see alternate and sustainable solutions seriously thought about, developed and implemented for out gravel needs.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1445	394 - 4	Jane Hambrook	Vancouver, BC	Think of me as naive a dreamer or just plain ignorant of the gravel industry, I'm okay with that, but I'm not okay with destroying any part of The Howe Sound's environment.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1446	395 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	My family and I have no objection to this project. We all need gravel.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1447	396 - 1	Lea Allen	Bowen Island, BC	I do not want this gravel mine to proceed. As a tax payer I do not want to have this development operating in the successful Sea to Sky tourist area. This is the wrong place to be digging up gravel!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1448	397 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I oppose the project for an open pit gravel mine in McNab Creek Valley.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1449	397 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Whatever cherry-picked "experts" may claim (remember that experts have their biases and affiliations), this project would devastate the local salmon and bird habitats, which are critical to BC's coastal ecosystems.	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare an environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1450	397 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Whatever cherry-picked "experts" may claim (remember that experts have their biases and affiliations), this project would devastate the local salmon and bird habitats, which are critical to BC's coastal ecosystems.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1451	397 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Whatever cherry-picked "experts" may claim (remember that experts have their biases and affiliations), this project would devastate the local salmon and bird habitats, which are critical to BC's coastal ecosystems.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1452	398 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am against this project for Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1453	398 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The Proponent's claim that it is a necessary operation due to demand in Vancouver, is not accurate.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1454	398 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The 12 jobs they will employ full time, rob other BC Corps from key personnel.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1455	398 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). Their offset plan for mitigating has a huge possibility of not working. Who would be monitoring this closely? The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
1456	398 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic. Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1457	398 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Night scapes are enjoyed by the residents and with 80% of the worlds night scapes reduced this needs to be considered. The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year</p> <p>Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1458	398 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>
1459	398 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1460	398 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
1461	398 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25 years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
1462	398 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1463	399 - 1	Lauren Ollsin	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I had hoped this selfish project proposal would never be reconsidered. Just because the gravel is there and could cheaply be stolen and the estuary ruined, doesn't mean it should be. As a champion of wild fish and as a sailor, I strongly oppose this proposal.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1464	399 - 2	Lauren Ollsin	North Vancouver, BC	I had hoped this selfish project proposal would never be reconsidered. Just because the gravel is there and could cheaply be stolen and the estuary ruined, doesn't mean it should be. As a champion of wild fish and as a sailor, I strongly oppose this proposal.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1465	400 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>"Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700.</p> <p>Burnco has big plans for a large scale gravel mine at McNab Creek at the northern end of Howe Sound. If it gets the green light, it'll crush and process gravel 24 hours a day, 365 days a year." -<a href="http://www.straight.com/news/633181/dermod-travis-outlandish-donations-bc-political-parties">http://www.straight.com/news/633181/dermod-travis-outlandish-donations-bc-political-parties</a></p> <p>This report is 2 years old. How much more has Burnco donated, during an election year, in attempts to grease the wheels that this project goes through.</p> <p>It's been clearly repeated below that the human and environmental impacts of this project are unacceptable. Do the right thing and stop it from happening.</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1466	401 - 1	B. Underhill	Bowen Island, BC	No graville pit in McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1467	401 - 2	B. Underhill	Bowen Island, BC	We don't want it and no further tugs, barges shipping the crap down Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1468	402 - 1	Kate O'Connor	Squamish, BC	This project will negatively affect the salmon habitat in this environmentally sensitive area. The salmon runs are decreasing and we need to protect McNab creek against industry that will decrease salmon populations.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1469	402 - 2	Kate O'Connor	Squamish, BC	The saltwater leeching from the pit into the creek will kill salmon and have disastrous effects to the ecosystem at many levels as the salmon play an integral role in the ecosystem functioning.	The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.
1470	402 - 3	Kate O'Connor	Squamish, BC	The proponent has no experience managing a marine environment for an aggregate mine and there are also no air quality monitoring stations nearby, causing further concerns for other species. This mine would cause serious environmental degradation to a sensitive area causing ripple effects to many other ecosystems. I urge you to protect this sensitive area and decline the application for industry here.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1471	403 - 1	I. Sarama	Gibsons, BC	After a century of damage from the legacy of industrial abuse, Howe Sound is finally showing signs of recovery.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1472	403 - 2	I. Sarama	Gibsons, BC	The expansion of this type of industry will do nothing to enhance this recovery, and in fact, will cause further damage. For example, how can this project help herring and salmon stocks in the area of the MacNabb Creek estuary? It cannot, and will not, and will only cause further harm.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1473	403 - 3	I. Sarama	Gibsons, BC	Do not allow this permit!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1474	404 - 1	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1475	404 - 2	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1476	404 - 3	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) is underestimated.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1477	404 - 4	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1478	404 - 5	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1479	404 - 6	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., five years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1480	404 - 7	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1481	404 - 8	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1482	404 - 9	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1483	404 - 10	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
1484	404 - 11	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1485	404 - 12	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
1486	404 - 13	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1487	404 - 14	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1488	404 - 15	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1489	404 - 16	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1490	404 - 17	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1491	404 - 18	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1492	404 - 19	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1493	404 - 20	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1494	404 - 21	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
1495	404 - 22	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1496	404 - 23	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
1497	404 - 24	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1498	404 - 25	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1499	404 - 26	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
1500	404 - 27	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1501	404 - 28	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1502	404 - 29	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1503	404 - 30	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
1504	404 - 31	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1505	404 - 32	Judith Holm	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1506	405 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>I am a resident of Bowen Island and a long time recreational user of Howe Sound. I am unequivocally opposed to the Burnco project. Whether considered from an economic, ecological for social perspective, the project does not merit approval. When all of these considerations are taken into account, The case for refusal is overwhelming.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1507	405 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Economic –while the project undoubtedly would provide economic benefits, they are outweighed by the economic benefits tourism and recreation would provide. The alternative uses are not compatible. Further, the economic benefit of a gravel mine can be achieved elsewhere in the province, which is not the case for tourism and recreation, the economic values of which are dependent on proximity to Metro Vancouver.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1508	405 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Ecological – Mcnab Creek is one of the last estuaries in Howe Sound that has not been intensively developed. The estuary has significant fisheries values, which will be completely destroyed if the project proceeds, and which cannot be replaced. From an ecological perspective the project has no benefit whatsoever. This alone should lead to rejection.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1509	405 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Social –public opinion is overwhelming that the Howe Sound environment should be treasured and protected. Regard should be had to this public opinion. A large scale industrial development in Howe Sound will diminish the recreational opportunities for the many thousands who know use the sound and the many more thousands who will seek recreational opportunities near to Metro Vancouver in future. The proximity of an environmentally healthy and aesthetically attractive Howe Sound to Metro Vancouver is vital to the quality of life enjoyed by residents today and the millions who will be here in future. The project does not merit approval.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1510	406 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Brackendale, BC	Please DON'T allow this project to proceed. The environmental damage will far outweigh public benefit.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1511	407 - 1	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	Comments to Environmental Assessment Office regarding Burnco Aggregate Project McNab Creek, Howe Sound, BC Submitted October 2, 2016  Dr. Robert Turner, 710 Minnows Lane, Bowen Island, BC V0N1G2 Personal background BSc Geological Engineering, Queens University; MSc, PhD Geology, Stanford University Research scientist, Geological Survey of Canada, Vancouver 1989-2014 Resident, Bowen Island, 1989 - present Mayor, Bowen Island, 2005-2011 Lead organizer, 1991 Howe Sound Environmental Science Workshop and co-editor of conference proceedings (Levings et al, 1991).	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1512	407 - 2	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Estuaries are ecological jewels. The entire Howe Sound inlet has very limited wild and functional estuary. McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. Why would you mine it?</p> <p>McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. Estuaries form a tiny portion of Howe Sound's total shoreline but are its richest shoreline habitats in terms so biodiversity and biological productivity. Estuaries are ecological jewels in the broader context of Howe Sound's ecological function and deserve our highest protection.</p> <p>Question 1.1: Where else in BC has an estuary been mined for gravel? If there is/has been such a mine, what environmental mitigation strategies where employed. Was remediation successful? If not, why would the Burnco application be allowed to set a precedent for such an ecologically damaging activity?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1513	407 - 3	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Burnco proposal largely blocks the animal corridor between upper McNab valley and shoreline, functionally disconnecting estuary from uplands.</p> <p>The proposal intends to fill three quarters of the lower one kilometer of the McNab Creek valley with a 24/7 industrial operation that will alienate that area from wildlife, and spread industrial noise throughout the lower valley for at least the project lifetime. It is inconceivable that this industrial noise and land alienation will not greatly limit the function of the lower valley as habitat and greatly disconnect migration of mammals such as elk, black bear, wolves, and grizzly bear between upper valley and the shore. Local observations show the estuary is heavily used by elk and black bear, and occasionally by grizzly bear and wolves. I have visited McNab Creek many times and have seen the tracks.</p> <p>Question 2.1: How will the project proposal offset the project impacts on elk, bear and wolf migration along the valley floor from upper valley to estuary?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1514	407 - 4	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 2.2: Given ongoing forestry operations in McNab Creek valley, and extensive past cutting of valley floor forests, and recent construction of the Box Canyon power project, how does the additional impact of the Burnco proposal relate to the cumulative impacts of other past and ongoing industry in the valley?</p> <p>Question 2.3: What cumulative effects assessment has been made of ecosystem health of the McNab Creek valley?</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1515	407 - 5	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The project will permanently isolate McNab Creek from migration across the majority of its natural floodplain.</p> <p>The natural habit of the river is to wander back and forth across its natural floodplain and estuary. Berms surrounding the proposed pit will permanently restrict McNab Creek to the eastern margin of the estuary. The berms will isolate the Creek from three quarters of its natural fan delta, removing the Creek's ability to directly replenish sediment to the western part of the estuary and create diverse habitats. Given ongoing sea level rise, forecast to be at least 1 m rise by 2100, this lack of direct sedimentation to the western estuary will increase the risk of shoreline erosion, wet meadow and tidal flat erosion, and shoreline retreat, with consequent valuable habitat loss throughout this area.</p> <p>Question 3.1: What mitigation is proposed to offset the loss of natural river-mouth migration, and the loss of sediment deposition and natural aggradation across the western side of the estuary?</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>
1516	407 - 6	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Why permit a "wet" gravel mine?</p> <p>Almost all of BC's gravel resources are located on forested hillsides. These "dry" aggregate resources are abundant in the south coast region, sufficient for decades of development needs. Dry deposits typically do not occupy vital ecological landscapes given that forested slopes are extensive (and therefore not unique) throughout the region. Burnco on the other hand is applying to mine a "wet" gravel resource that occupies a critical high ecological value estuary. This makes no sense to my geological experience. It is well understood that the mining industry doesn't get to choose where a resource is. Sometimes the resource is in the wrong place to mine. McNab Creek estuary is just such a location.</p> <p>Question 4.1: Why should a gravel mine be permitted in an ecologically sensitive area, when there are extensive undeveloped gravel resources in much less sensitive areas?</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1517	407 - 7	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Inappropriate location for a Processing/Stockpiles Area</p> <p>At McNab, a forest 30-300m wide of second growth sitka spruce-hemlock forest 80-250 years old fringes the entire estuary shoreline. This mature forest is an essential element of the estuary, forming a natural transition between upland and wet meadow-tidal flats of the intertidal estuary. The entire one kilometer of estuary shoreline with fringing forest, intertidal marsh and mud-sand-cobble tidal flats intact at McNab Creek. This coastal strip is the most valuable and sensitive part of the estuary.</p> <p>The Processing/Stockpiles Area is proposed within the fringing forest of this coastal strip. This will require clearing of a large tract of mature second growth 80-250 year old hemlock-sitka spruce forest. This forest zone is 150-200m wide at the Processing/Stockpiles Area site and all but a sliver-thin buffer will be lost.</p> <p>Question 5.1: Why is the processing facility not located inland, north of the power line, and well back from the most ecologically sensitive area of the estuary?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> </ul> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1518	407 - 8	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Inadequate proposed reclamation plan due to incorrect downgrade of forest capability from Class 1 forest to Class 3 forest</p> <p>The following is based on 4.0 Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan Document, Golder Associates. Forest capability mapping done prior to logging and published in 1984 (Serryk and Perry 1984) rated the project area forests as a Class 1 forest. The proponents argue that, because it is “disturbed”, the area should be downgraded to a Class 3 forest area, and that required reclamation only need to compensate to a Class 3 forest level (page 6). But the proponents provide no evidence of disturbance beyond previous logging.</p> <p>Question 6.1: Why would a provincial government “forest capability” map that was based on observation of the existing forest type (Serryk and Perry 1984) not be the accurate assessment of what the forest capable of growing in the project area? Why would logging of the forest change the capability of the site to grow a forest?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1519	407 - 9	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Proponent soil assessment is inadequate.</p> <p>No soils mapping was conducted by the proponent. Rather a series of soil pits were used to test the soils and interpolate soil characteristics between pits (Figure 3). The pit locations are not on any type of grid, or guided by existing soil mapping, and so the location of the test pits appears arbitrary, and provides no confidence that the soil pits are representative of the soils in the project area.</p> <p>Further, the proponent excludes examination and discussion of the soils in the Processing/Stockpiles Area. The Golder report states on page 6 “The Proposed Project Area consists of unvegetated or sparsely vegetated areas; small pockets of shrub dominated, sapling forest, and young forest structural stages. Mature forest is located to the north and east, outside of the Proposed Project Area.”</p> <p>Question 7.1: Why is there no mention of the mature forest areas that will be cleared for the Processing/Stockpiles Area at the shoreface?</p>	<p>We recognize that soils mapping was conducted at a reconnaissance level and based on existing geotechnical borehole and test pit data and existing publically available soils maps. We believe that this information was sufficient for EAC Application/EIS that required LSA soils mapping at a 1:5000-scale.</p> <p>Subsequent soil surveys including additional soil plot locations in the Processing Area, plus select soil sample collection and analytical testing for soil quality will be completed prior to surface preparation. This information combined with the preliminary EAC Application/EIS soils mapping and geotechnical subsurface data will be used to prepare updated soil maps and soil salvage and reclamation plans as required for the BURNCO Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA).</p> <p>Mature forest areas that will be cleared are noted in Volume 2, Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS: The Proposed Project will remove approximately 3.3% (4 ha) of mature coniferous forest for the marine conveyor belt system in the LSA.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1520	407 - 10	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Curiously, no soil pits were dug in the proposed Processing/Stockpiles Area area where a mature Class 1 forest currently stands.</p> <p>Question 7.2: Why did the proponent not sample any of the soils in the Processing/Stockpiles Area?</p>	<p>No soil pits were dug in the noted areas. Soil sampling and analytical testing for soil quality and reclamation is required to satisfy the Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA). As approved by the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM), a detailed soil sampling program will be provided in the Reclamation and Closure Plan of the BURNCO MAPA. Proposed soil surveys and select sampling will be completed in the Processing Area and mature forest areas prior to construction activities.</p>
1521	407 - 11	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The proponents arguments that given that the land has been logged, therefore its "forest capability" has been reduced from a Class 1 to a Class 3 forest appears to lack basis. The proponents soil pit study does not provide evidence that the sites chosen for sampling are indeed representative of the project area. Confidence in this study is further eroded by the lack of soil sampling of the proposed Processing/Stockpiles Area, a standing Class 1 forest. All this leads to a larger question.</p> <p>Question 7.3: Why is the reclamation plan not based on reestablishing a Class 1 forest after closure?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1522	407 - 12	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Environmental bonding</p> <p>Given the high ecological values of McNab Creek estuary, and the large impacts this proposal will impose on the estuary, and the critical role that estuaries play in Howe Sound, this proposal also poses serious risks to the larger ecosystem health of Howe Sound. Should a mine go ahead, it is critical that environmental reclamation and monitoring of reclamation works be successful to the highest standards. To ensure reclamation compliance, and public confidence that this will indeed be achieved, significant environmental bonds need to be in place.</p> <p>Question 8.1: What criteria are being used to evaluate the necessary level of environmental bonding for reclamation?</p> <p>Question 8.2: What amount of reclamation bonding is required of the proponent before start of works?</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1523	407 - 13	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>This project will expand industrial activity to a new greenfield site in Howe Sound. This project is not compatible with the ongoing recovery of Howe Sound from past industrial activity, nor its recreational use. Is this the highest and best use for Howe Sound?</p> <p>It is widely recognized that Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. A recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy. The Province has invested heavily in this enterprise, not the least of which are the ongoing costs of managing Britannia Mine effluent. As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. A new industrial operation on a new greenfield site with significant ecological impacts is out of step with these trends.</p> <p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1524	407 - 14	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1525	407 - 15	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	Question 9.1: What criteria suggest that this proposal is compatible with the "highest and best use" of the McNab Creek estuary and northern Thorborough Channel?	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1526	407 - 16	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	Question 9.2: What criteria suggest that the impacts of this proposal will not be detrimental to the ongoing recovery of marine ecosystems of Howe Sound?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1527	408 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Hard for nature to continue to thrive when projects like this are approved. I am Not in favour of this project	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1528	409 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am opposed to this proposal due to the large impact on the watershed and limited economic impact.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1529	409 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	In particular impact on a salmon bearing stream.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1530	409 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Existing brownfield sites in howesound are much more appropriate for economic development.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1531	410 - 1	Donna Lawrence	West Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1532	411 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	This project is not compatible with the ongoing recovery of Howe Sound from past industrial activity, nor its recreational use. Is this the highest and best use for Howe Sound? This project will harm what is becoming a strong tourist attraction with the return of whales, dolphins, orcas, and fishing.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1533	411 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	It is widely recognized that Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. A recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy. The Province has invested heavily in this enterprise, not the least of which are the ongoing costs of managing Britannia Mine effluent. As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. A new industrial operation on a new greenfield site with significant ecological impacts is out of step with these trends.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1534	411 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1535	411 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1536	412 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Who in government is assessing this project and what are the environmental criteria. It is astonishing this could even be eligible to be proposed. What about the economic assessment ? Surely Howe Sound is more valuable to British Columbia as a recreational/tourist asset than a gravel mine for an Alberta company.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1537	413 - 1	John Buchanan	Squamish, BC	1.) Throughout the downstream side of the project there are a multitude of ground water channels that are essential rearing areas for both Coho and Chinook. For the moment I am not taking about the big main spawning channel constructed, but the smaller ones along either side. Construction of this gravel mine would cut off all fresh water supplies to these naturally occurring channels. My field studies prove that these smaller channels are very productive streams.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1538	413 - 2	John Buchanan	Squamish, BC	<p>2) The big main Spawning channel that was constructed does work. The multiple times over the last three years that I have gone in to do field work have indicated to me that not only the constructed ground channel is very productive contrary to the proponents claims but there is an array of smaller natural ground water channels that come from the site that prove to be very good rearing areas for coho fry. Couldn't keep them out of my traps. In the very top end of the constructed ground channel I thought my trap was stuck on something then realized it was weighted down by cut throat. Also I hate seeing these dated photos of the ground water channel at all the presentations. Today the ground water channel is nicely vegetated in. There is quite a large Beaver dam at the lower end that prevents spawners from gaining access to the upper end but this could be notched every fall to rectify the situation, but of course if your trying to paint a picture of absence of fish and bleakness you wouldn't want to promote such a thing would you ? This of course is what this process for the proponent is all about. It's an old developers game. Down play the habitat and pay little to no compensation.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
1539	413 - 3	John Buchanan	Squamish, BC	<p>3) The main creek McNab, would be threaten, in what can only be described as a planned catastrophic drying up of a well know spawning area for Pink, Chinook, coho, and yes even Sockeye Salmon have been documented in the creek. You don't have to be an expert in hydrology to see what will happen. The creek already experiences a drying up of the creek at the top end of the planned mining area. This drying up usually in August, start of Sept. prevents any Salmon from entering the creek system. The mines activities would create this massive crater causing the bottom of McNab creeks water to basicly drain out and dry over a much longer period completely wiping out all runs of spawning salmon. Yes the proponent is planning to build berms to dam the waters but the elevations required to maintain the integrity of the water contained in McNab creek would have to be huge in height, and be three sided, berm along the shore line and Berm to the right and to the left of the property.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1540	413 - 4	John Buchanan	Squamish, BC	In conclusion I would ask that this project be turned down. I have included one of my many field reports from the last 3 years that clearly shows the productivity of the area for Salmon.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1541	414 - 1	Lea Bradford	Bowen Island, BC	I can not believe this is even under consideration....what are you thinking?  No. No. No. Please. No.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1542	415 - 1	George C. Hamilton	Brackendale, BC	I do not believe that the proposed gravel mine in the McNab Creek area should be approved.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1543	415 - 2	George C. Hamilton	Brackendale, BC	Any "economic benefits" which might derive from the project for various parties would be far outweighed by the massive environmental degradation which would result from the project.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.
1544	415 - 3	George C. Hamilton	Brackendale, BC	There are many potential gravel sources -- there is only one Howe Sound, a priceless jewel particularly in view of its close proximity to Metro Vancouver.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1545	416 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Don't do it. It is such a wonderful beautiful place, how many of these natural beauties do we have to give up for the profit of a company.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1546	417 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Clearly, there is no conscience when it comes to monetary greed which is what this proposal appears to be. Please, in the name of present generations and of those to come, do not be remembered for permitting the destruction of this pristine estuary.  DO NOT ALLOW the Burnco Aggregate Project to proceed. Thank you.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1547	418 - 1	Anne Miles	Gibsons, BC	Please do not re-industrialize Howe Sound. It is more valuable, in so many ways, in its natural state.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1548	419 - 1	Jan de Beer	Langdale, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco Aggregate Project and all industrial activity in the Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1549	419 - 2	Jan de Beer	Langdale, BC	We have finally seen whales returning to this area during the last 3 years.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1550	419 - 3	Jan de Beer	Langdale, BC	Howe Sound should be designated as a World Heritage Site (UNESCO) instead of ripping it apart for a few measly jobs. Few major Cities have access to unspoiled nature as Vancouver do with Howe Sound at its doorstep. What a shame if this project should go through!	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1551	420 - 1	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to you in opposition to the wet gravel mine proposed for McNab Creek by Burnco.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1552	420 - 2	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	First, why would anyone mine an estuary in an area (Howe Sound) that is still recovering from earlier industrialization.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1553	420 - 3	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	The whole area, which is the recreational area for Vancouver and the Lower Mainland, has a high tourism and ecological value.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1554	420 - 4	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	Because of intensive post-industrial remediation, we who live in Howe Sound are seeing the return of herring and anchovies and large mammals such as dolphins, sea lions and whales.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1555	420 - 5	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that a small population of elk have been re-established near McNab Creek and will be affected by a mine. Other indigenous animals will be cut off by the mine from the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1556	420 - 6	Susan Alexander	Bowen Island, BC	Please, for all our sakes, turn down this application for a gravel mine on this important habitat. Why would the province bother doing all the costly remediation work of Britannia Mines and other industrial sites to turn around and undo it by approving this proposal? Thank you for your careful and attentive work protecting our home.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1557	421 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I am a young person who grew up on Bowen Island in Howe Sound and a biologist and oceanographer. I am writing to you in opposition to the wet gravel mine proposed for McNab Creek by Burnco.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1558	421 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	First, why would anyone mine an estuary in an area (Howe Sound) that is still recovering from earlier industrialization.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1559	421 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	The whole area, which is the recreational area for Vancouver and the Lower Mainland, has a high tourism and ecological value.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1560	421 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Because of intensive post-industrial remediation, we who live in Howe Sound are seeing the return of herring and anchovies and large mammals such as dolphins, sea lions and whales.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1561	421 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that a small population of elk have been re-established near McNab Creek and will be affected by a mine. Other indigenous animals will be cut off by the mine from the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1562	421 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Please, for all our sakes, turn down this application for a gravel mine on this important habitat. Why would the province bother doing all the costly remediation work of Britannia Mines and other industrial sites to turn around and undo it by approving this proposal? Thank you for your careful and attentive work protecting our home.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1563	422 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	This Burnco Aggregate Project must not be approved. Howe Sound is finally cleaning up after decades of mills polluting the air and water. This would be a catastrophe! We must not continue to destroy the environment. Do not approve this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1564	423 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	It is completely inappropriate to allow the Burnco gravel mine to operate in this incredibly beautiful and environmentally sensitive area of Howe Sound. Given the slow, but important recovery finally occurring in this area, no project like this should ever be approved. I strongly oppose this project.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1565	424 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Totally inappropriate location for this type of enterprise. Howe Sound is just starting to recover from previous industrial misuses - let's not take a giant step backwards.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1566	425 - 1	Jonathan Bennett	Bowen Island, BC	I implore you not to approve this mine project. Howe Sound is one of the planet's jewels - you can count on the fingers of one hand the deep ocean sounds close to major metropolitan areas - and it is gradually, visibly recovering from decades of industrial misuse. It would be not only wicked but stupid to let something happen that will slow or even reverse that recovery.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1567	426 - 1	Luisa Nitrato Izzo	Squamish, BC	This project presents a serious risk to salmon and salmon habitat. For this reason I STRONGLY urge you to reject the proposal. We must protect this valuable salmon habitat for generations to come through wide stewardship, not destroy it through projects such as this one that seriously threaten our environment. Thank you.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1568	427 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	BC	No. No and no....leave my BC alone. No	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1569	428 - 1	Martin Smith	North Vancouver, BC	I am writing to urge against the proposed gravel mine operation at McNabb Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1570	428 - 2	Martin Smith	North Vancouver, BC	There are not many wild areas left near Vancouver but those like McNabb creek estuary should be left to develop naturally. Thankyou for considering my views	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1571	428 - 3	Martin Smith	North Vancouver, BC	There are not many wild areas left near Vancouver but those like McNabb creek estuary should be left to develop naturally. Thankyou for considering my views	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1572	429 - 1	Dr. R. Bruce Bessie	Furry Creek, BC	My family has resided within the corridor for 48 years. Over this period of time , the Sound has slowly recovered from a devastatingly low point when the Biritianna mine and Woodfiber pulp mill were both seriously contributing to the decline of marine life within this Southern most fjord of the BC coast .	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1573	429 - 2	Dr. R. Bruce Bessie	Furry Creek, BC	Over this time ,we have witnessed the huge tourism growth within the corridor and fully supported the goals of the previous BC government agencies in developing this corridor as the center piece of " Super Natural BC ". This Southern Fjord is a jewel and is the centrepiece of the tourism and recreation market .	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1574	429 - 3	Dr. R. Bruce Bessie	Furry Creek, BC	The value of this market in taxes, revenue generation and employment far out ways the return from an industrial mine, especially when there is no need for further development of this resource , according to statistics from already operational gravel mines within the lower mainland.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1575	429 - 4	Dr. R. Bruce Bessie	Furry Creek, BC	The value of this market in taxes, revenue generation and employment far out ways the return from an industrial mine, especially when there is no need for further development of this resource , according to statistics from already operational gravel mines within the lower mainland.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1576	429 - 5	Dr. R. Bruce Bessie	Furry Creek, BC	With my university educated background , I feel that approval of this application is VERY shortsighted and I truly hope you will recognize the potential danger that approval of this application may have on such a great BC tourism asset . I hope you will weigh the value of Howe Sound to the Super Natural BC image and will be good long range thinkers!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1577	430 - 1	Susan Swift	Bowen Island, BC	Honourable Assessors, I am a relatively new resident (3 years) of Bowen Island in Howe Sound, a beautiful fjord that is home to Bowyer, Bowen, Gambier, Anvil, and the Pasley Islands. My husband owns a kayak business on Bowen Island and we depend on tourism and the health of our marine environment for our survival.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1578	430 - 2	Susan Swift	Bowen Island, BC	We view the BURNCO mine application with horror, knowing that it threatens the Sound's recovery (as documented by David Suzuki and others.) We are just one family dependent on the sea, but there are many, many, many krill, plankton, herring and anchovy "families" who also call this home. The marine food chain depends upon these families thriving in order to support seals, sea lions, whales, dolphins, cod, and salmon -- the oceanic ambassadors of British Columbia. The BURNCO mine is a documented threat to the families that rely on a healthy Howe Sound for their survival. <a href="http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound">http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/anchovy-schools-are-back-in-session-with-phenomenal-numbers-spawning-in-howe-sound</a> Thank you for your consideration.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1579	431 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Salt Spring Island, BC	I lived in Squamish from 1980-84 then from 1988-2015. During that time I have witnessed the slow recovery of Howe Sound and its communities from resource industry activity. Britannia Mine, Woodfibre Pulp and Paper, Nexen Chemical plant, various woodsorts, the port facility, the railway and its expansion have all had an impact on the health of the environment and left a legacy of contamination to deal with. Knowing what we know now, from the history of the industry ...the toxins in the soil and water, the disruption of ecosystems on land and in water and the air quality issues I cannot believe that any further industrial activity is being considered. Clean energy is the path that we need to be taking.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1580	431 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Salt Spring Island, BC	None of the proposals for Howe Sound can be justified to be clean industry and safe for the environment. Specifically, the Burnco project is on one the the last remaining estuaries on our south coast. This development should not be given any approval.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1581	432 - 1	Steven Threndyle	North Vancouver, BC	As a freelance travel writer who specializes in writing about British Columbia, I have to go on record as saying that the head of Howe Sound is one of the wildest, yet oddly most accessible, places I've ever been. A short boat ride from West Vancouver or Squamish, and you are transported into a wonderful ecosystem of productive fishing habitat, Coast Range mountain peaks (the McNab Lions!) and a pristine stretch of beach.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1582	432 - 2	Steven Threndyle	North Vancouver, BC	The tranquility of this special spot would be severely compromised by the Burnco Gravel operation; both from a scenic and - far worse - the sonic disturbance of gravel crushers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1583	432 - 3	Steven Threndyle	North Vancouver, BC	The tranquility of this special spot would be severely compromised by the Burnco Gravel operation; both from a scenic and - far worse - the sonic disturbance of gravel crushers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1584	432 - 4	Steven Threndyle	North Vancouver, BC	Please consider how special Howe Sound is and make this region part of a wilderness area or put it into the provincial park system. Save this precious land for our children... some of whom are photographed enjoying McNab Creek, here.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1585	433 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	Over the past 16 years living on Howe Sound I have watched the painfully slow but amazing recovery of sea life here. I am worried that without a holistic approach to regulate big industry on Howe Sound that we will again wipe out what lives in and around these waters. My degree is science, but I am well aware of the need for some industrial considerations but not for this project at McNab Creek.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1586	433 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	The negatives here far outweigh the incorrectly perceived need for gravel at this location.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1587	433 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	It would be disastrous for the salmon, prawns, recreational boaters and the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1588	433 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	It is a mystery to me how government can think that such a close marriage between tourism and heavy industry could possibly work. The corridor needs to be protected or our touted "pristine Sea to Sky tourism" could die. Please vote NO on this project!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1589	433 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Furry Creek, BC	The corridor needs to be protected or our touted "pristine Sea to Sky tourism" could die. Please vote NO on this project!	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1590	434 - 1	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Please receive the attached document as the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association's review of the Environmental Impact Statement of the proposed Burnco Aggregate Project in Howe Sound, British Columbia.</p> <p>This submission has been compiled from concerns raised by our members and the community at large. It is founded on local and professional knowledge of the McNab Watershed and surrounding environment. This document was written with an emphasis on the upland impacts of fish and fish habitat, as well as impacts on the McNab estuary, forage fish populations, and glass sponge reefs.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1591	434 - 2	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Howe Sound was closed in 1963 to commercial fishing for the purposes of stock management and to preserve the sports fishery. In the 1970's McNab Creek was identified as one of three more gently sloping streams on the west side of Howe Sound with a significant estuary (there being none on the east side) and therefore had significant capabilities, along with the Squamish River, for supporting the fishery in Howe Sound. Escapement records for McNab Creek go back to 1950, with sport fishing for Cutthroat Trout and Steelhead recognized as early as 1935. In 1991, workers of Canadian Forest Products, Mainland Logging Division, were recognized for their ten years of Salmon Enhancement Program efforts at McNab Creek by the Head of the Public Involvement Program, Department of Fisheries & Oceans. In 1999, a provincial Fish and Fish Habitat Inventory noted that the creek still contained important spawning and rearing habitat for anadromous salmonids, Cutthroat and Steelhead. McNab Creek is considered a major Chum system within the Howe Sound/Sunshine Coast Area with a management escapement goal of 10,000 (2009).	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1592	434 - 3	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The above is only a partial account of the high, long-known, historical values of salmonids, Cutthroat Trout and Steelhead in the McNab Creek watershed. BURNCO, in their first two unsuccessful attempts to obtain authorizations from Fisheries & Oceans Canada (DFO), and in acknowledging in the Purpose of Application that the proposed project is subject to a comprehensive study review under the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Act as a result of a required approval under the Fisheries Act, should recognize the primary importance of these species.	BURNCO agrees that there is historical importance of salmonids in the McNab Creek watershed. BURNCO has endeavored to adjust the design and mitigation measures of the Proposed Project to avoid or limit the potential effects of the Proposed Project on salmonids and their habitats. Efforts were made to design the Proposed Project so that it would not reduce baseflows in McNab Creek. With the implementation of the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS) it is expected that the amount of salmonid habitat than is currently present will be increased.
1593	434 - 4	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Yet, BURNCO's Project Description of the Summary does not refer to the expected impact of the Project on these specific valued components. It should include a statement of maintaining or improving salmonid, Cutthroat and Steelhead (Salmonidae) populations and habitats during construction, operation and effective closure.	The Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat assessment (Section 5.1 of the EAC Application/EIS) and the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-A of the EAC Application/EIS) indicate that the amount of available habitat for salmonids will be increased.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1594	434 - 5	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Vol. 2, 5.1.6 Conclusions notes that "All potential Project-related residual adverse effects (on fish and fish habitat valued components) were determined to be negligible – not significant and requiring no further consideration." This statement is based largely on a hydrological model that would set the hydrostatic pressure in the 30 ha, 30 m deep wetted pit during the 16 years of operation slightly above the baseline water conditions in McNab Creek. The proponent expects that there would then be no ground water loss in McNab Creek, as presently occurs to the upper reaches of the existing compensation channel; the slight net increase is evaluated as positive. This model also believes that the downslope impact on the estuarine waterways would increase and the net benefit is seen as positive.</p> <p>The SCCA disagrees with this assessment. The baseline studies on the Salmonidae utilizing the surrounding fresh and marine waterways are not comprehensive enough to judge the potential impact of a failure, in particular pit containment. Further, a suite of Spill &amp; Emergency Response Plans and Compensation Plans must be developed prior to construction for the variety of failures possible (e.g. sudden loss of water in McNab Creek, sudden overwhelming and or sediment contamination of estuarine waterways). In order to develop appropriate plans, baseline studies must be completed to determine which species, their age and their behaviour (e.g. transit, rearing, spawning) are expected to be in the water ways at any given time. Further studies and changes to fisheries habitat protection during construction and operations, and climate change</p>	<p>In order to ground-truth the expected result of the groundwater model, BURNCO will monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake throughout the operational phase. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels will be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis will be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>A consequence analysis regarding the Pit Lake Containment Berm as well as the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke are being conducted and will be submitted with the Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA). This analysis will consider the potential effects on fish and fish habitat in the downstream environment. In addition, an assessment of the loss of containment of the Pit Lake on fisheries and freshwater habitat was presented in the EAC Application/EIS in Section 5.1.5.4.2.2.</p> <p>A Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan as a well as a Emergency Response Plan will be developed and will include what to do in the event of loss of containment of the pit lake. An outline of these plans is presented in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Freshwater fish and fish habitat baseline studies completed are presented in Appendix 5.1-A. Baseline studies included electrofishing, fyke netting, minnow trapping, adult salmon spawner surveys, beach seining and benthic invertebrate community surveys. BURNCO has also committed to conducting fish habitat monitoring and fish community monitoring within the fish-bearing streams of the LSA to determine if there are any measurable changes to fish habitat utilization during the Proposed Project. This is described in Section 17.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1595	434 - 6	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Selection and rationale omits Steelhead Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>). This species has suffered significant declines over that last 20 years and is susceptible to changes and loss of key habitats that include; degradation to rearing (most importantly parr rearing) and access to holding and spawning areas.</p> <p>It is assumed that the rationale for the omission of Steelhead is that the project footprint does not directly impact their habitat. While no direct impacts may occur, alteration of mainstem flow does have the potential to impact both Steelhead adult migration and alter accessible juvenile rearing habitats that are located adjacent to and above the project footprint area. It is known that Box Canyon Creek, found immediately upstream of the project area provides both Steelhead rearing and spawning. The McNab Creek mainstem immediately above and below Box Canyon Creek confluence also supports Steelhead rearing and spawning.</p> <p>Given the importance of this species regionally and the concern regarding potential effects of gravel mining on stream flows, Steelhead must be included as a VC.</p>	<p>Steelhead was not included as a Valued Component (VC) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Observations of steelhead within the LSA were infrequent.</li> <li>-The consideration of stream flow and water quality in relation to other salmonids would also speak to potential effects on steelhead and their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale for the selection of VCs was provided in the Approved Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines and in Section 4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1596	434 - 7	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Selection and rationale omits Chinook Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>). Chinook in the Strait of Georgia have shown many years of low returns and there is still uncertainty about their long term abundance. Given that Species-at-Risk designated Orcas depend on Chinook, populations of Chinook regardless of size need to be protected. Perhaps the project footprint will not directly impact their habitat but the alteration of mainstem flow in McNab Creek can impact adult and juvenile migration. Impacts to the foreshore caused by the flow from the pit could also impact the juveniles as they transit to the salt water. Chinook must also be included as a VC.</p>	<p>Chinook salmon was not included as a Valued Component (VC) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Observations of chinook salmon within the LSA were infrequent.</li> <li>-The consideration of stream flow and water quality in relation to other salmonids would also speak to potential effects on chinook and their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale for the selection of VCs was provided in the Approved Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines and in Section 4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1597	434 - 8	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Table 5.1-2 states Chinook have similar habitat needs to other species. The habitat requirements of Chinook salmon are not similar to that of other salmonids that are being considered in the assessment. Therefore the effects on anadromous Chinook salmon must be separately assessed of the other salmonid VC's.</p>	<p>The consideration of potential changes to broad habitat parameters including changes in stream flow and water quality are applicable to chinook salmon. During the freshwater component of their life history chinook salmon need adequate flows of clean well oxygenated water similar to other salmonid species .</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1598	434 - 9	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Table 5.1-2 states Steelhead have similar habitat needs to other species. Certainly they do coexist with both Coho and Cutthroat but Steelhead and in particular adults and parr have specific and limiting habitat preferences. On the South Coast Steelhead parr habitat is typically the limiting factor to their success. This habitat (boulder dominated riffles) is found along the project interface and should be included in any project risk analysis, and mitigation strategy.	Steelhead adults and parr are not commonly present within the LSA. The consideration of potential changes to broad habitat parameters including stream flow and water quality are applicable to steelhead. Consideration of stream flow and the avoidance of any baseflow reduction in McNab Creek is expected to address potential effects on steelhead in the McNab Creek mainstem.
1599	434 - 10	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The planned mining is within the historic alluvial fan and it should be assumed that alteration to the centre of this deposition will also have implication on the sections of this geomorphic feature surrounding the centre excavation. The upper boundary of this historic deposition should be the upper boundary of the LSA, thereby pushing the LSA closer to the confluence with Box Canyon Creek.	<p>The spatial boundaries for the Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat EA have been selected to take into account the physical extent of the Proposed Project and the physical extent of Project-related effects.</p> <p>The LSA was set to include the lower reach of the McNab Creek mainstream, which extends from its mouth upstream to the northern edge of the Project Area based on where the Project had the potential to affect stream flow.</p> <p>The RSA was set to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-All mainstem reaches of McNab Creek and tributary catchments of the McNab Creek watershed; and</li> <li>- Marine intertidal and shallow subtidal habitat areas potential affected by Proposed Project activities.</li> </ul> <p>The RSA includes the confluence with Box Canyon Creek.</p>
1600	434 - 11	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	"...the assessment of adverse Proposed Project effects on freshwater fish and fish habitat encompass three major Proposed Project phases, as defined in Volume 2, Part A - Section 2.0 of the EAC Application/EIS:" The SCCA was unable to locate Part A of Volume 2 on the BC Environmental Project Information Centre. (Sept. 23, 2016). A fourth "predevelopment" phase of assessment should be added to determine baseline populations of Salmonidae and their habitats (freshwater & marine).	<p>Volume 2 of the EAC Application/EIS (Sections 5.6 through 9.3) was posted to the BC EAO epic website on 2016/08/03 and is available at the link: <a href="http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/html/deploy/epic_document_355_40820.html">http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/html/deploy/epic_document_355_40820.html</a>.</p> <p>The pre-development phase of the Proposed Project was defined as the baseline for each discipline. The baseline for Marine Resources is presented in Section 5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS and is also provided in more detail in two appendices (Appendix 5.2-A and 5.2-B). The baseline for Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat is presented in Section 5.1.4 of the EAC Application/EIS and is also provided in more detail in one appendix (Appendix 5.1-A).</p>
1601	434 - 12	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Temporal boundaries are presumably timeframes for continued study. The idea that fish and fish habitat is examined only one-year post operations is unacceptable. A framework for documenting positive or negative change must be provided. This must be a meaningful, statistically robust, comparison that also provides options for additional compensation and/or restoration, resulting from unforeseen impacts. A detailed monitoring plan must be developed that uses predevelopment baseline, operations and post operations data to ascertain the impacts of effects of the project on the Salmonidae. This report must be publicly posted.	The temporal boundaries provided in the EAC Application/EIS for each discipline are not timeframes for contained studies, rather they are established for the assessment of adverse Proposed Project effects on Valued Components (VCs). A follow-up monitoring strategy for Fisheries and Freshwater habitat is outlined in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS. The timeframe and strategy for the monitoring of fish bearing watercourses potentially affected by the Proposed Project as well as the offsetting habitat will be established in consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). This information will be provided in the Fisheries Act Authorization permit application. A draft of the monitoring plan for the offsetting habitat is provided in Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS and will be updated for the purposes of the Fisheries Act Authorization. Monitoring data will be compared to pre-development data collected for the purposes of the baseline program. Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat baseline data collected is outlined in Appendix 5.1-A of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1602	434 - 13	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Base flows are reported as a net improvement over the life of the project. What appears to be missing is an instream flow assessment that looks at changes, positive or negative, on fish habitat, including migration and rearing. This assessment should present all possible scenarios and link clearly the surface water analysis to fish habitat (and impacts on amphibians) to the creation of the wetted pit. It is assumed that the net increase is an average over 12 months. How does this look monthly and during critical life history periods of each of the identified Salmonidae? A detailed instream flow assessment with appropriate surveys of channels cross sections and appropriate modelling should be provided.	Instream flow assessment (such as Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM)) was not considered necessary for the assessment of Proposed Project effects on the McNab Creek mainstem and the majority of the foreshore groundwater-fed watercourses. This was because the groundwater and surface water modelling predicted small to moderate increases in baseflows that would lead to increases in wetted usable fish habitat areas. Predicted increases in baseflow would occur as groundwater influxes along the length of the watercourses. These influxes will follow the current seasonal flow regime.  The foreshore groundwater-fed watercourses are tidally influenced with daily fluctuations in both depth and velocity. The utility of habitat simulation modeling in these circumstances is questionable since the juvenile fish using the area tend to associate with pool habitat where wetted usable area is relatively unaffected by changes in flow. Consideration of spawning habitat is also questionable since spawning in groundwater-fed watercourses tends to be associated with zones of groundwater upwelling. Based on the predictions of the modelling, the amount of groundwater influx in the lower segment of WC 2 is predicted to increase by approximately 50% with creation of the pit lake.
1603	434 - 14	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Base flow conclusions are based on a model that assumes current area ground waters and the created off-channel WC2 draw base flow from the mainstem of McNab Creek. There are a lot of assumptions that hinge on the model being correct. Modelling of all possible outcomes and potential mitigative measures should be presented. What, for example, if the model is wrong and the base flows drop even for one season due to climate change? It would be expected that the operations of the mine cease until baseline conditions return and should be stated in the Spills & Emergency Response Plans.	A Water Management Plan is currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA) and the Water Sustainability Act permit application. This plan will provide a long-term water management and monitoring strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. Throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Project the owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake that were predicted through modelling. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.
1604	434 - 15	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	It was reported that few Steelhead were captured in McNab mainstem. Recent sampling for the upstream Box Canyon Hydro project has resulted in a significant number of juvenile Steelhead captured in the mainstem and habitats around Box Canyon Creek. In addition, spawning Steelhead were documented in Box Canyon in 2016. Potential effects on Steelhead (as noted earlier) should be included.	Steelhead adults and parr are not commonly present within the LSA. The consideration of potential changes to broad habitat parameters including stream flow and water quality are applicable to steelhead. Consideration of stream flow and the avoidance of any baseflow reduction in McNab Creek is expected to address potential effects on steelhead in the McNab Creek mainstem.
1605	434 - 16	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Section 5.1.4.2 downplays the population size and area importance of the remaining salmon and anadromous trout returning to McNab Creek. Rather than enumerating the average number of historic spawners, maximum historic numbers for each species given would be appropriate – e.g. 1,500 Chum and 3,500 Pinks were recorded in the escapement record for 1951.	Section 5.1.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS considers accidents and malfunctions and may not be the correct section. Section 5.1.3.1 of the EAC Application/EIS speaks to historical salmon returns to McNab Creek. Reporting on average numbers of returning spawners is common practice as this provides more useful information about the productivity of the system. Reporting on maximum historical numbers is interesting, but without consideration of habitat availability and actual smolt production, may provide limited information regarding actual productivity of the system.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1606	434 - 17	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Recent numbers have been depressed (except Pink Salmon) and are likely the result of lower ocean survivals. The assessments and proposed design does not provide any assurance or mitigative suggestions to ensure that the quality and quantity of existing salmonid habitats remain in the Regional Study Area – McNab Creek.	The design of the Proposed Project avoids effects to the baseflows of McNab Creek. The Proposed Project design is predicted to result in increases to baseflow in all of the foreshore minor streams below the proposed pit lake except for WC 2. There will be direct and indirect losses of habitat in WC 2 associated with the Proposed Project. These losses will be addressed through the implementation of the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS) that will create more salmonid habitat than will be affected by the Proposed Project. Approximately 500 m of groundwater-fed fish habitat will be lost as a result of the Proposed Project; the offset plan will create approximately 790 m of new groundwater-fed fish habitat. A multi-year monitoring program will be implemented to evaluate Proposed Project related effects predicted in the assessment and to evaluate the success of the Fish Habitat Offset Plan.
1607	434 - 18	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Indirect loss of salmonid habitat is actually reported. There seems to be some contradiction between sections. Earlier the document suggested there was a net increase and/or base flows will not change so habitat remains the same. There is no breakdown of how losses would occur and when. Clarification is needed.	Section 5.1.4.1.2.1.1 of the EAC Application/EIS provides a breakdown of direct (e.g., habitat loss) and indirect effects (e.g., baseflow) on fish habitat during construction. Similar breakdowns are provided for operations and closure. All of the direct losses of fish habitat will occur during construction. To address these effects BURNCO has committed to constructing the habitat offset extension prior to the loss of the upper section of WC 2 to reduce the potential for temporal loss in the potential productivity of the system.
1608	434 - 19	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Section 5.1.5.3.2 refers to the proposed approach during construction and follow-up. This is unclear. A monitoring program that includes typical construction and operations environmental parameters should be required. There should also be a robust monitoring program designed that compared VC's (Including Steelhead and Chinook) pre and post development in the expanded LSA and immediately outside the expanded LSA. In this case, expanded baseline data in McNab would be established before development, during operations (16 years), and then for a statistically appropriate period post operations.	<p>The proposed monitoring program for the Proposed Project will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational EPPs as stated in Section 16.0 of the EAC Application/EIS. Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program. Monitoring programs provide an opportunity for local community members and First Nations groups to be involved in the development and implementation of monitoring initiatives. This will be clearly defined within the final monitoring framework which will be developed for each of the areas described below. This is outlined as construction monitoring within Section 5.1.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Additional details regarding compliance monitoring of Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat is provided in the Fisheries Habitat Protection and Mitigation Plan outlined in Section 16.2.2.6 of the EAC Application/EIS. This plan will be further developed for the Fisheries Act Authorization application.</p> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks. The effects monitoring strategy for Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat is outlined in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS as the follow-up monitoring strategy. The effects monitoring strategy will outline the requirements for the monitoring of fish bearing watercourses potentially affected by the Proposed Project as well as the offsetting habitat and will be established in consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). This information will be provided in the Fisheries Act Authorization. A draft of the monitoring plan for the offset habitat is provided in Appendix 5.1-B and will be updated for the purposes of the Fisheries Act Authorization. Monitoring data will be compared to pre-development data collected for the purposes of the baseline program. Baseline data collected with respect to Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat is outlined in Appendix 5.1-A.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1609	434 - 20	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	In addition to the environmental monitor preparing and submitting to FLNRO and to DFO regular environmental monitoring reports documenting construction activities, effectiveness of mitigation measures, incidents, non-compliant events, corrective action taken and photograph documentation during construction, reports shall also be submitted during operation of the mine.	<p>An outline of the environmental management program for the Proposed Project, including information regarding environmental monitoring and reporting, is provided in Section 16.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The purpose of the Environmental Management Program is to assist BURNCO and its contractors in adhering to applicable environmental legislations and Proposed Project Commitments and Assurances specified in the EAC Application by providing performance-based environmental requirements, standard protocols, and mitigation measures to avoid and reduce the potential for environmental effects throughout the Proposed Project. Effective planning and application of Construction and Operational Environmental Management Programs through the implementation of Construction and Operational Environmental Management Plans (CEMP and OEMP) will reduce the potential for adverse environmental effects.</p>
1610	434 - 21	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Further and in accordance with the recent revisions to the fisheries protection provisions of the Fisheries Act; in the event of a non-compliant incident during construction and/or operation the monitor must immediately contact DFO's Observe, Record and Report and then report the non-compliant incident to the BC Environmental Assessment Office.	The comment is in line with the mitigation strategy for Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat. As stated in Section 5.1.5.3.2.1 and 16.2.2.6 of the EAC Application/EIS "In accordance with the recent revisions to the fisheries protection provisions of the Fisheries Act; in the event of a non-compliant incident the monitor will contact DFO's Observe, Record and Report (ORR) line (1-800-465-4336) and report the incident."
1611	434 - 22	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	We challenge the statements that 'Residual Effects' to fish habitats are low. The proponent states there is a potential to impact habitats through surface water change, coupled with only modelled data. The risk can not be low; at the very least it should be moderate.	<p>The conclusion that effects to fish and fish habitat will be low are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the baseline data collected</li> <li>- the modelled predictions</li> <li>- commitment to monitor surface water levels</li> <li>- commitment to monitor the groundwater gradient</li> <li>- commitment to adaptively manage the extent of the excavation and design of the pit lake in response to monitoring information</li> </ul> <p>With the implementation of the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS) it is expected that the amount of available salmonid habitat will be increased from existing conditions.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1612	434 - 23	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>As stated on page 1, the SCCA challenges the statement that the net residual effects for anadromous and resident fish are negligible. The premise that there are negligible effects is based on the creation of new habitat and that the base flows remain unchanged. In the event the model is flawed, the potential to impact migrating adult and juvenile salmonids is high. In the event the base flows become lower/higher through piping, avulsions, dyke failure or dam failure, the impact to rearing and spawning habitats become high.</p> <p>It should be noted that the calculations and opinions are based on the proponents' LSA; it should be based on the extended LSA which would include the entire historic alluvial fan.</p>	<p>The conclusion that effects to fish and fish habitat will be low are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the baseline data collected</li> <li>- the modelled predictions</li> <li>- commitment to monitor surface water levels</li> <li>- commitment to monitor the groundwater gradient</li> <li>- commitment to adaptively manage the extent of the excavation and design of the pit lake in response to monitoring information</li> </ul> <p>With the implementation of the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS) it is expected that the amount of available salmonid habitat will be increased from existing conditions.</p> <p>The LSA was set to include the lower reach of the McNab Creek mainstream, which extends from its mouth upstream to the northern edge of the Project Area based on where the Project had the potential to affect stream flow.</p> <p>The RSA was set to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-All mainstem reaches of McNab Creek and tributary catchments of the McNab Creek watershed; and</li> <li>- Marine intertidal and shallow subtidal habitat areas potential affected by Proposed Project activities.</li> </ul> <p>The RSA includes the confluence with Box Canyon Creek.</p>
1613	434 - 24	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Appendix 5.1-A</p> <p>The lack of mainstem sampling (electrofishing in particular) is questioned. It is our understanding that the mainstem MC 1 through 5 were sampled only in 2010. There is a conclusion here and elsewhere that Steelhead impact is negligible because of the lack of fish in the system. If this conclusion is only based on one year of sampling, this is inadequate. Baseline should have been repeated along the LSA and into the Regional Study Area (RSA) over a longer time period.</p>	<p>Using potentially lethal techniques such as electrofishing to reconfirm fish presence when low numbers have already been identified was determined to be inappropriate. The risk to the resource outweighed the need for additional confirmation of presence. Proposed Project design and mitigation measures incorporated a conservative approach and included the potential for low numbers of steelhead to be present in the system. Mitigation measures included design elements (e.g., extent of pit) that avoided reductions in McNab Creek baseflows where steelhead are known to be present. The lack of potential residual effects as a result of the implementation of mitigation measures, rather than a lack of steelhead, is what supports a determination of negligible impact.</p>
1614	434 - 25	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>There was no sampling conducted in January or February of any year in the mainstem, for example. At the least this and instream flow assessments must be conducted to determine Salmonidae presence and requirements.</p>	<p>Please see above response. Winter sampling of salmonid populations tends to be unreliable and with the possibility of eggs being present in the gravel it was not considered appropriate. The movement of salmonids into overwintering habitat (deep pools or interstitial spaces within the substrate) is well documented. Lower temperatures and lower metabolic rates reduce movements and feeding. Lower temperatures also limit the effectiveness of electrofishing for population estimation.</p>
1615	434 - 26	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Trap data show limited smolt catches in the mainstem. An alternative method would have made more sense and may have increased success, such as a Rotary Screw in the upper areas above the lower depositional area, or fixed channel traps in the lower reaches of the mainstem. Fyke nets, while effective in the right areas (intertidal) provide limited catch data for larger smolts (Steelhead and Cutthroat).</p>	<p>Smolt sampling in the McNab Creek mainstem was conducted to identify and compare smolt migration in relation to smoltification in WC 2. It was not attempting to provide a population estimate for McNab Creek. It is true that other methods could have been used but the methods used are considered adequate for the purpose intended.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1616	434 - 27	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The baseline should provide a robust and statistically significant study of pre and post development. This requires multiple years' pre and post data.	That is true to a degree, however, salmonid populations tend to be highly variable and the freshwater portion of their lifecycle is not the only time when density dependent and/or density independent factors may impact their survival. In spite of this, BURNCO will implement a multi-year environmental effects monitoring program to evaluate the accuracy of predicted potential effects on fish and fish habitat.
1617	434 - 28	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	There was no effort to enumerate adult migrating anadromous Cutthroat and Steelhead. Both species migrate past the LSA to the upper reaches. This data would provide evidence for determination of VC's.	It is known that both steelhead and cutthroat trout are present in the McNab Creek mainstem. Both anadromous and resident cutthroat were selected as Valued Components (VC) based on their presence in the LSA and potential for being affected by the Project. Steelhead were known to be infrequently present in the LSA as they migrate past the area to upstream reaches in the watershed. The potential for interaction between steelhead and Proposed Project activities was considered small therefore steelhead were not selected as a VC.
1618	434 - 29	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Instream flow assessment using potential changes in base flow to model habitat changes and channel connectivity must be incorporated.	Instream flow assessment (such as Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM)) was not considered necessary for the assessment of Proposed Project effects on the McNab Creek mainstem and the majority of the foreshore groundwater-fed watercourses. This was because the groundwater and surface water modelling predicted small to moderate increases in baseflows that would lead to increases in wetted usable fish habitat areas. Predicted increases in baseflow would occur as groundwater influxes along the length of the watercourses. These influxes will follow the current seasonal flow regime.  It is true that the loss of the upper segment of WC 2 will lead to a reduction in surface water flow entering the lower segment of WC 2. The reduction in surface flow was predicted to lead to a 116 m2 reduction in average wetted area which was considered as habitat loss and will be addressed through the implementation of the habitat offset. The lower segment of WC 2 is tidally influenced with daily fluctuations in both depth and velocity. The utility of habitat simulation modeling in these circumstances is questionable since the juvenile fish using the area tend to associate with pool habitat where wetted usable area is relatively unaffected by changes in flow. Consideration of spawning habitat is also questionable since spawning in groundwater-fed watercourses tends to be associated with zones of groundwater upwelling. Based on the predictions of the modelling, the amount of groundwater influx in the lower segment of WC 2 is predicted to increase by approximately 50% with creation of the pit lake.
1619	434 - 30	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Appendix 5.1-B A plan was developed to address loss of WC2 (the DFO Channel) and the footprint of the loading facility. The approach adopted to address the loss of WC2 (the compensation channel) was to develop a new area of off channel and "hard" habitat located in the in marine near shore. The marine offset plan requires more supporting information and the very small areas proposed should be enlarged.	The Fish Habitat Offset Plan provided in Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS was developed to address the loss of the upper segment of WC 2 (and associated baseflow effects) as well as the loss of intertidal and subtidal habitats as a result of installation of the piles for the barge load-out jetty. To offset the loss of the upper segment of WC 2, a new extension of the lower segment of WC 2 has been proposed as outlined in Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS.  For the loss of habitat in the foreshore portion of the LSA, a total of 18 pilings, 42 cm in diameter will be installed (Figure 5.1-4) for the barge load-out jetty. The direct fish habitat loss associated with their installation is estimated to be less than 5 m2. The narrow width (< 2 m), height above the water (> 5m) and orientation (North/South) of the conveyer structure indicate that it is unlikely to cause any shading effects on intertidal or shallow subtidal habitats. To address the residual effects in the marine foreshore area, BURNCO is proposing to construct approximately 10 m2 of hard substrate intertidal habitat attached to the pilings supporting the conveyer system across the foreshore.  The Fish Habitat Offset Plan will be further refined in consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and other stakeholders for the purposes of the Fisheries Act Authorization.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1620	434 - 31	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The SCCA is concerned with the long-term viability of any constructed channel. In the event that the off channel is accepted, there should be a legal, long-term commitment to maintain the channel for numerous years post operations. The failure rate of created off-channels is high. In most cases, this is a result of proponents meeting their post construction commitments, and then ceasing to maintain the habitats, which leads to channel failure. This is a significant concern with the proposed offset proposal but can be rectified by a long-term legal commitment.	BURNCO expects that a multi-year monitoring program and letter of credit (to address monitoring and repair of the proposed habitat offset) will be a requirement of the Fisheries Act authorization. BURNCO will comply with these regulatory requirements.
1621	434 - 32	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Hydrostratigraphy (Sec 5.6.4.3) The consultants state that the hydrogeological properties of a possible fault structure within the bedrock that may parallel McNab Creek valley is not known. Further they note that "...the hydrogeological significance of this fault structure, if it exists, would only be high relative to the groundwater flow system in the valley fill aquifer if it is laterally continuous, highly permeable and of considerable width." The properties should be evaluated to determine the significance of this geological structure.	The closest fault structures mapped near the project are on Gambier Island and Anvil Island approximately 5 km towards the south and south east, and near Foulger Creek and Woodfibre Creek approximately 12 km towards northeast (iMapBC online database). The database does not contain any mapped fault structures in the McNab Creek valley. Although their existence cannot be ruled out, it is likely that if a laterally extensive and wide structure existed in this area, it would have been identified during previous mapping efforts. Potential contribution from minor fault structures or fractured rock zones have been included in the hydrogeological model, and the model sensitivity analyses showed that model predictions are much less sensitive to groundwater contribution from bedrock compared to groundwater fluxes in the shallow unconsolidated sediments. This is expected, as these shallow sediments are in the direct hydraulic connection to McNab Creek and are significantly more permeable than any structures that may exist at depth in bedrock.
1622	434 - 33	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Project – VC Interactions (Sec 5.6.5.1) Although project – VC Interactions are identified there is no recognition that probable climate changes have the ability to affect groundwater flows during the lifetime of the proposed project. Further studies prior to construction must be conducted to prepare for these effects.	Climate change would affect the flows in McNab Creek and the losses from McNab Creek under current conditions (i.e., no mining). As presented in Appendix 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS, seepage losses from McNab Creek are predicted to reduce during mining after blockage of the upper portion of the groundwater channel (WC2) and gradually become close to baseline conditions in the later years of the Project. Additional modelling has shown that, for example, under different climate conditions that might be associated as well with climate changes (extended periods of dry weather or intense precipitations) the current baseline conditions would still result in more losses from McNab creek than if mining were to occur during the same period.
1623	434 - 34	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Operations (Sec 5.6.5.2.1.2) The water removed from groundwater during operations to provide make-up water to the wash plant is identified as representing a reduction in groundwater flow. The effect of this water on surface water flow needs to be further accounted for.	As described in Section 5.6.5.2.1.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, during operations, the groundwater water well installed during construction will be pumped to provide make-up water to the wash plant at a rate of approximately 160 m3/day. This water will be removed from groundwater and represents a reduction in groundwater flow. Although groundwater flow will be affected near the well, which will be installed near the wash plant, it represents less than 0.3 % of the total groundwater flow through the valley deposits and as such will have negligible effect to overall groundwater and surface water flow. Table 5.6-6 of the EAC Application/EIS presents the predicted effects to groundwater flow as a result of the aggregate mining and the pumping of the water well. This reduction in groundwater flow was included in the assessment of surface water baseflows and is presented in the Appendix 5.6-A and 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS.
1624	434 - 35	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Mitigation (Sec 5.6.5.3) It is stated that "Monitoring of the groundwater flow rates, hydraulic heads and quality will be conducted during construction and reclamation and closure". Monitoring must also be conducted through the operations phase should this project be approved	A Water Management Plan, prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. Throughout the operational phase of the project the owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1625	434 - 36	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Conclusions (Sec 5.6.6)</p> <p>More details need to be provided in the assertion that the quality of the groundwater resulting from the wetted pit and entering the down slope waterways during operations will not be compromised and negatively affect the ecosystems.</p>	<p>As stated in section 5.6.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, the significance of potential effects to groundwater flow and groundwater quality through construction, operations, and reclamation and closure are considered negligible – not significant. The assessment of significance used an approach that was conservative in nature so that there is a high level of confidence that the Proposed Project-related effects have not been underestimated. Effects to groundwater quality are considered to be negligible – not significant; no water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME guidelines throughout operations and reclamation and closure. A Water Management Plan, was prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, and provides a more detailed plan for surface water quality monitoring than the conceptual plan proposed in the EA. Regular surface water quality monitoring in minor creeks and McNab Creek during the mine life is proposed in the Water Management Plan, consistent with the EA. These waterbodies represent the downstream receiving aquatic environment. A direct surface connection between the pit lake and the receiving environment is not expected during operations; it will only be established at closure when the constructed offset habitat is connected to the pit lake. At that time, pit lake water will be monitored to confirm the prediction made in the assessment that pit lake water does not represent a deleterious substance and would be unlikely to cause pollution in the downstream receiving environment.</p> <p>If mine-related changes in surface water quality during the mine life consistently exceed provincial and federal water quality guidelines and concentrations can be distinguished from the baseline conditions, then biological monitoring will be triggered to determine if these changes have impacted aquatic resources in the downstream receiving environment. Relevant groundwater data will be reviewed as part of the adaptive management process. Further details are provided in the Water Management Plan.</p>
1626	434 - 37	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Technical Boundaries (Sec 5.5.3.2)</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment of the Proposed Project's potential effects and residual effects on base flow and extreme low flow were based on numerical modelling with limited calibration. It is also noted that the proponent plans to continue monitoring site conditions (presumably groundwater and surface water) and to recalibrate the model as the project progresses. This technical boundary must be dealt with before the project begins. If the project is approved before this is resolved, then re-calibration of the model as the project progresses must be made a mandatory condition of the environmental certificate. Changes to the water balance model and water management practices resulting from the re-calibration must be communicated immediately to the BC Assessment Office and DFO.</p>	<p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p> <p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the water balance model and analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. Changes to the hydrogeologic water balance model results and any resulting recommended changes to the mine plan shall be communicated to the regulatory authority. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1627	434 - 38	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The consultants correctly recognize the limitations of the climate and hydrological baselines conditions used because they were largely based on available long term regional data as there was limited local data. The use of the Water Survey Canada (WSC) hydrometric station located at Chapman Creek above Sechelt is troubling as it does not provide current data and that watershed has a distinctively different climate regime; therefore the water flows are expected to be different. Further hydrological studies should be conducted on McNab Creek directly to determine baseline conditions throughout the year which then need to be entered into the model.	It is recommended that flow monitoring on McNab Creek be carried out throughout the operational phase of the project. This will be detailed in the Water Management Plan that will be provided during the Water Sustainability Act permitting process.
1628	434 - 39	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Changes in Surface Flows (Sec 5.5.5.2.1.) The statement that "The extent of the proposed pit will be re-evaluated if the calibrated and refined results suggest that a negative impact to aquatic habitat in McNab Creek is anticipated" must be a condition of the environmental certificate should the project be approved.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
1629	434 - 40	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Although increased baseline flows in McNab Creek as a result of operations and reclamation/closure can be viewed as a positive as it would resume creek flow during current summer "droughts", the same can not be concluded for the lower segments of WC2 and the Minor Foreshore Streams. The benefit/harm needs to be evaluated against the individual fish species requirements of each waterway. Increased flow and wetted area are not suitable evaluations. It is not understood, for example, how a predicted increase of 53% in the closure phase of base flow in the Minor Foreshore Streams can be evaluated as positive to the fish and fish habitats.	The predicted changes to baseflows in each of the foreshore minor streams are provided in Table 5.5-15 of the Surface Water Resources Section of the EAC Application/EIS. The estimates are provided as m3/day. When these values are converted into m3/second the changes to baseflow are minor. Increases in average depth are predicted to be < 2.8 cm and are presented in Table 5.5-17 of the EAC Application/EIS. These watercourses are low gradient (<1%) and influenced by tidal backwatering. The additional baseflow will be provided as increased groundwater upwelling that will enter the watercourses along their length rather than at one location. The additional baseflow will cause minor increases to average water depth or water velocity. Fish species using these habitats are adapted to a range of changing depths and velocities associated with the tidal fluctuation (e.g., backwatering). The additional baseflow is also not expected to cause additional scouring or erosion as the watercourses are currently influenced by daily changes in depth and velocities associated with the tidal fluctuations. The small amounts of additional wetted area that will be provided by the increased baseflow are considered positive as it will lead to a minor increase in the amount of available fish habitat. The additional upwelling of groundwater will also increase water movement and exchange through the gravels present in the substrate of these channels.
1630	434 - 41	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Climate change modeling elsewhere in the document has indicated an increase in extreme events, increased intensity of rainfall and increased periods of drought. Such events and conditions must be evaluated in the model and appropriate plans created before the Project were to begin.	It is not anticipated that climate change will have a significant effect on the findings of the study during the operation phase of the Project. Provision for climate change will be included in the design of Project components which will remain after the closure such as the McNab Creek Flood Control Dike, the Pit Lake Containment Berm and the Pit Lake Spillway.
1631	434 - 42	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Not stated in this Section is how the evaporation loss from a 30 ha wetted pit versus the evapotranspiration of the initial vegetation cover is considered in the water model.	The hydrogeological modelling and analysis conducted for the Project is presented in Part G, Section 22, Appendix 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS.  Confirming that increased evaporation resulting from the change in pit lake surface area was incorporated into the model. Specified flux boundary that represents recharge to groundwater from precipitation was automatically adjusted during model simulation in the area of the pit lake for increased evaporation at each phase of mine development.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1632	434 - 43	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	With respect to the reduced base flow in WC2 during the proposed project operations it should be stated that they are projected to have negative potential effects. Further, it needs to be stated how the proponent will deal with this expected impact on the Salmonidae and their habitats	The potential effects of a reduction in baseflow in the lower segment of WC 2 on fish species is assessed in Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted change in wetted area is identified as a reduction in available habitat that is documented in the habitat balance provided. This reduction is also identified in the habitat offset plan (Appendix 5.1-B of the EAC Application/EIS). The habitat offset plan is designed to address both the direct physical loss of habitat in the upper section of WC 2 and the indirect reduction in habitat associated with a reduction in baseflow entering the lower section of WC 2.
1633	434 - 44	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	If the proposed project is accepted there must be a legal long-term commitment to monitoring and maintenance of the relocated compensation channel for numerous years post operations. Monitoring for more than 1-year post closure and reclamation of the McNab Creek and the Minor Foreshore Streams must also be committed to.	Habitat offset monitoring will be conducted for the offset habitat to confirm that habitat offset measures outlined in the Habitat Offset Plan are followed and to assess the functionality of the offset habitat over the long-term. The habitat will be monitored upon completion of construction and an initial monitoring report with as-built drawings will be provided to regulatory agencies. The initial monitoring report will confirm whether the construction of the offset habitat meets the performance criteria outlined in the Habitat Offset Plan. The offset habitat will then be monitored during years 1, 2, 3 and 5 (if necessary) and monitoring reports will be provided to regulatory agencies. If the long-term performance objectives of the offset habitat are not being met, regulators will be consulted to identify appropriate remediation measures. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G - Section 22: Appendix 5.1-B. Additional details of the habitat offset monitoring will be provided in the Fisheries Authorization permit application.  In addition, fish habitat and fish community within the fish-bearing streams of the LSA will be monitored to determine if there are any measurable changes to fish habitat structure and function. This is described in Section 17.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1634	434 - 45	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>In order to comply with Sec 38(4) of the Fisheries Act R.S.C 1985, a survey specific to intertidal spawning forage fish (winter and summer Surf Smelt and Pacific Sand Lance) needs to be conducted across the entire intertidal area. The habitat survey must be conducted according to current forage fish sampling protocols. It is recognized that forage fish are a cornerstone of the marine food web.</p> <p>Forage fish make up a minimum of 50% of the diet of adult Coho salmon and Pacific Sand Lance &amp; Herring comprise 72% of an adult Chinook salmon's diet. Larval and juvenile Sand Lance form a major portion of a juvenile Chinook's diet. Chinook salmon, in turn, are a major food source for the SARA identified South Coast population of Orcas.</p>	<p>Surf smelt (<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>) tend to spawn on gravel and sand beaches near the high tide line, where overhanging vegetation is present ((Schaefer 1936, Penttila 1995). The timing of spawning is variable with different stocks spawning during summer, winter or year-round. Summer spawning of surf smelt requires overhanging canopies of trees growing in the backshore to shade eggs during the summer incubation period (Penttila 2002; Rice 2006). Overhanging riparian vegetation in the intertidal zone of the LSA is limited. Pacific sand lance (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>) live near the shore year-round and spawn on sand or pebbled beaches in the mid to upper intertidal zone during the winter (November–February), often using the same beaches as the surf smelt (Schaefer 1936, Penttila 1995).</p> <p>Both surf smelt and pacific sand lance tend to spawn on beaches dominated by fine gravel and course sand. They do not tend to spawn on beaches with abundant fine sediment. The shoreline of the LSA has fairly extensive and productive salt marsh cover. The fine sediments associated with this salt marsh habitat is unlikely to support surf smelt or Pacific sand lance spawning in these areas.</p> <p>Given the unfavorable habitat conditions presently available in the subtidal areas of the marine Proposed Project footprint due to wood debris and the lack of suitable herring spawning habitat (e.g., eelgrass, understory malcroalgae, and canopy kelp) the potential for herring spawning to be affected by the Proposed Project was considered unlikely.</p> <p>If required by regulatory agencies, an intertidal forage fish spawn survey could be conducted in accordance with standard forage fish egg sampling procedures (Moulton and Penttila 2001) prior to the start of the piling program. Additional mitigation that might be implemented during construction to manage adverse impacts on spawning areas includes limiting machine access and avoiding grounding within the mid and upper intertidal zone.</p> <p>Moulton, L.L. and D. Penttila. 2001. Field manual for sampling forage fish spawn in intertidal shore regions. San Juan County Forage Fish Assessment Project. 23 p.</p> <p>Penttila, D. 1995. Investigations of the spawning habitat of the Pacific sand lance, (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>), in Puget Sound. Pages 855-859 in Puget Sound Research-95 Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2. Puget Sound Water Quality Authority, Olympia,</p>
1635	434 - 46	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Marine Fish (Sec 5.2.4.6)</p> <p>Please provide the assessments that conclude that "No sensitive fish habitats overlap with the proposed Project Area, including no known spawning sites for key forage fish species (e.g., herring or capelin)."</p>	<p>Detailed mapping of ecologically sensitive areas is presented in the marine resources technical baseline report (Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0, Appendix 5.2-A) and the marine mammal technical baseline report (Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0, Appendix 5.2-B) of the EAC Application/EIS. In Appendix 5.2-A, specifically refer to Figure 3 for mapping of sensitive aquatic habitats including glass sponges and sponge reefs, eelgrass beds, bull kelp and Rockfish Conservation Areas, and refer to Figure 5 for mapping of sensitive spawning habitat for Pacific herring, Pacific sand lance and surf smelt. No sensitive fish habitats are present within the proposed marine infrastructure footprint (i.e. walkway conveyor or barge load-out jetty). Also see response above.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1636	434 - 47	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Baseline Conditions (Sec 5.2.4) &amp; Marine Resources Baseline Report (Appendix 5.2-A, Vol 4, Part G - Sec 22.0)</p> <p>The consultants note "... local marine waters are known to support herring and other important forage fish species such as Pacific sand lance, capelin and surf smelt," and "... no forage fish were identified during baseline sampling using beach seining techniques". Beach seining is not the accepted protocol for determining the absence or presence of intertidal spawning forage fish such as Pacific Sand Lance (PSL) and Surf Smelt. In addition, the beach seining dates would have missed the winter spawning PSL and winter spawning Surf Smelt.</p>	<p>Surf smelt (<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>) tend to spawn on gravel and sand beaches near the high tide line, where overhanging vegetation is present ((Schaefer 1936, Penttila 1995). The timing of spawning is variable with different stocks spawning during summer, winter or year-round. Summer spawning of surf smelt requires overhanging canopies of trees growing in the backshore to shade eggs during the summer incubation period (Penttila 2002; Rice 2006). Overhanging riparian vegetation in the intertidal zone of the LSA is limited. Pacific sand lance (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>) live near the shore year-round and spawn on sand or pebbled beaches in the mid to upper intertidal zone during the winter (November–February), often using the same beaches as the surf smelt (Schaefer 1936, Penttila 1995).</p> <p>Both surf smelt and pacific sand lance tend to spawn on beaches dominated by fine gravel and course sand. They do not tend to spawn on beaches with abundant fine sediment. The shoreline of the LSA has fairly extensive and productive salt marsh cover. The fine sediments associated with this salt marsh habitat is unlikely to support surf smelt or Pacific sand lance spawning in these areas.</p> <p>Given the unfavorable habitat conditions presently available in the subtidal areas of the marine Proposed Project footprint due to wood debris and the lack of suitable herring spawning habitat (e.g., eelgrass, understory malcroalgae, and canopy kelp) the potential for herring spawning to be affected by the Proposed Project was considered unlikely.</p> <p>If required by regulatory agencies, an intertidal forage fish spawn survey could be conducted in accordance with standard forage fish egg sampling procedures (Moulton and Penttila 2001) prior to the start of the piling program. Additional mitigation that might be implemented during construction to manage adverse impacts on spawning areas includes limiting machine access and avoiding grounding within the mid and upper intertidal zone.</p> <p>Moulton, L.L. and D. Penttila. 2001. Field manual for sampling forage fish spawn in intertidal shore regions. San Juan County Forage Fish Assessment Project. 23 p.</p> <p>Penttila, D. 1995. Investigations of the spawning habitat of the Pacific sand lance, (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>), in Puget Sound. Pages 855-859 in Puget Sound Research-95 Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2. Puget Sound Water Quality Authority, Olympia,</p>
1637	434 - 48	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>The SCCA agrees that "Juvenile and fish would be particularly sensitive to smothering and toxic effects of increased levels of turbidity and other contaminants, or from indirect effects of reduced food base (planktonic and benthic invertebrates) caused by Proposed Project activities" and that intertidal spawning forage fish are included in this statement.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1638	434 - 49	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Injury / Disturbance from Underwater Noise (Sec 5.2.5.3.1.2) &amp; Effects of Underwater Noise (Sec 5.2.5.2.3.1.3)</p> <p>If it is confirmed that PSL and Surf Smelt are spawning in the intertidal zone then the timing of the pile driving within the fisheries work window for Howe Sound (August 16- January 31) must also take these species into consideration.</p>	<p>The fisheries work windows are intended to represent least risk periods to fish during 'in-water' works. Pile driving in the high intertidal zone (where Pacific sand lance and surf smelt spawning would occur) will be conducted in the dry (at low tide, thus avoiding works in-water). As such, there will be no underwater noise generated during pile driving in this area, and by extension, no effects on Pacific sand lance or surf smelt spawning habitats as a result of in-water noise are expected. There is no evidence of physiological damage to fish eggs or larvae as a result of in-air noise exposure from pile driving.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1639	434 - 50	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Fish and Fish Habitat Baseline Report (Appendix 5.1.A) 2.3.5 Beach Seining (Sec 2.3.5) The sampling conducted once or twice a month at various sites between May and October, 2011 at various times of day and tidal stages would have missed the winter spawning window for PSL and Surf Smelt.</p>	<p>Surf smelt (<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>) tend to spawn on gravel and sand beaches near the high tide line, where overhanging vegetation is present. The timing of spawning is variable with different stocks spawning during summer, winter or year-round.</p> <p>Pacific sand lance (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>) live near the shore year-round and spawn on sand or pebbled beaches in the mid to upper intertidal zone during the winter (November–February), often using the same beaches as the surf smelt.</p> <p>Both surf smelt and pacific sand lance tend to spawn on beaches dominated by fine gravel and course sand. They do not tend to spawn on beaches with abundant fine sediment. The shoreline of the LSA has fairly extensive and productive salt marsh cover. The fine sediments associated with this salt marsh habitat is unlikely to support their spawning in these areas.</p> <p>If required by regulatory agencies, an intertidal forage fish spawn survey could be conducted in accordance with standard forage fish egg sampling procedures (Moulton and Penttila 2001) prior to the start of the piling program. Additional mitigation that might be implemented during construction to manage adverse impacts on spawning areas includes limiting machine access and avoiding grounding within the mid and upper intertidal zone.</p> <p>Moulton, L.L. and D. Penttila. 2001. Field manual for sampling forage fish spawn in intertidal shore regions. San Juan County Forage Fish Assessment Project. 23 p.</p>
1640	434 - 51	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Climate Station Selection (Sec 5.8.4.2.1) Although it is appreciated that the selection should follow an established protocol, it must be stated that the weather (temperature and precipitation) is significantly different from this location to that of the proposed Project especially with regards to precipitation – both rainfall totals and duration of events. A comparison of the marine weather reporting station at Pam Rocks (Climate ID 10459NN) for temperature and Port Mellon (Climate ID 1046330) for precipitation will verify this difference.</p>	<p>In areas with mountainous terrain, such as the area surrounding the Proposed Project site, meteorological data will vary at different monitoring stations. Typically only a small number of the stations have continuous, long-term data that is required to generate long-term climate normal data using 30 years of meteorological data, and subsequently allows climate trend analysis. The Pam Rocks meteorological station was commissioned in 1994, therefore does not have climate normal data (the most recent defined by Environment and Climate Change Canada is data for the period 1981 to 2010). Climate normal data for the 1981 to 2010 climate normal period was not available from the Port Mellon location.</p> <p>The Gibsons Gower point station was used to characterize the historical climate in the area, which looked for statistically significant trends in annual and seasonal data temperature and precipitation data over the climate normal period of 1981 to 2010, this historical analysis did not consider individual events such as the duration of individual rainfall events.</p> <p>The average annual total precipitation between 2007 and 2016 (for years when annual hourly data completeness was greater than 75%) was found to be 1113 mm at Pam Rocks and 2956 mm at Port Mellon. The climate normal average total precipitation at Gibsons Gower was 1,338 mm. Despite the average total precipitation at Port Mellon being greater than at Gibson Grower, the historical long term statistically significant trends are expected to be similar.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1641	434 - 52	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The other drawback to the protocol is in examining data only to 2010, 2015 was the warmest year on record in the world and 2016 is expected to surpass that record. Including data from 2010-2015 in the Gower Pt records would undoubtedly show an increased trend for a warmer and drier climate. It would indicate that climate change is already occurring and that should be noted in the report.	Meteorological conditions such as rainfall and temperature are expected to vary from year to year. This year to year variation is expected to be much greater than the longer term trends. The statistical analysis of the climate normal data (30 year dataset) from the Gibsons Gower Point station indicated that there were statistically significant changes (increases) in temperature and a decrease in precipitation in summer.
1642	434 - 53	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Project Considerations due to a Changing Climate (Sec 5.8.5.4) Given that the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration has confirmed that 2015 had the warmest average surface temperatures on the planet and that the consultants' own modeling predicts a warmer but wetter future at the projected project site, and has produced a Table (5.8-7) with specific climate factors, the SCCA disagrees with the statement that "Only Proposed Project components during the reclamation and closure phase could be affected as climate change will take many years to occur." The likelihood of climate infrastructure interactions occurring as early as the construction phase is high and the project should be designed to meet these changing conditions.	Meteorological conditions such as rainfall and temperature are expected to vary from year to year. Furthermore, the seasonal variability (e.g. differences between summer and winter for example) likely to be experienced at the Proposed Project site are greater than the projected change in climate in the near-term. Infrastructure will be designed to the current best practices and codes, which include allowances for the range of seasonal conditions. The inter-annual variability is important, however, in the short-term (e.g., during construction) changes due to seasonal variability will be more dominant. The range of temperatures between summer and winter is much greater than the increase in temperature from projected climate change in the near-term. Since construction activities will occur in the next few year, considerable climate-infrastructure interaction impacts from climate change are not expected.
1643	434 - 54	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Climate Risk Matrix (Table 5.8-8) As per arguments above that a base climate station was chosen with much reduced precipitation records, and did not include the last 5-6 years of climate data, this skews not only the arrival of climate change but also the extent of potential interactions with the project. The description of potential interactions with climate change across all phases of the proposed project is challenged with the exception of reclamation and closure. It is agreed that "For example, future changes in temperature, rainfall and storm events may impact the rate at which the aggregate pit refills with water" and that "Changes to climate may impact species found in the area." Revised modelling would likely prove that these changes would arrive much earlier in the life of the proposed project.	According to Environment Canada "Climate Normals and Averages are used to summarize or describe the average climatic conditions of a particular location. At the completion of each decade, Environment Canada updates its Climate Normals for as many locations and as many climatic characteristics as possible." (Government of Canada. 2014. Canadian Climate Normals. Electronic resources. <a href="http://climate.weather.gc.ca/climate_normals/index_e.html">http://climate.weather.gc.ca/climate_normals/index_e.html</a> ). At the time of the assessment the most up-to-date climate normal datasets generated by Environment and Climate Change Canada were for the 1981 to 2010 period. These datasets were used in the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1644	434 - 55	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	Project Considerations due to Changing Climate (Sec. 5.8.5.4) Although it is stated that the "Proposed Project will consider the potential for climate factors such as extreme weather events, increased precipitation and temperatures, while designing Proposed Project infrastructure to minimize potential impacts of a changing climate on the Proposed Project", there is no reference to specifics, which should be included.	Infrastructure will be designed to the current best practices and codes, which include allowances for the range of seasonal conditions.
1645	434 - 56	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The effects of increased drought, changes in rainfall patterns and extreme weather events must be considered not only in the context of infrastructure interactions but also on impacts of Salmonidae (and other wildlife). Mitigation plans and Spill Response & Emergency Plans must be specifically developed prior to the construction of any kind to deal with the possibility of failure in the models caused by weather events thereby ensuring that there is no harm to fish and fish habitat caused directly or indirectly by the proposed project.	<p>In order to groundtruth the expected result of the groundwater model, BURNCO will monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake throughout the operational phase. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels will be used to to inform the progressive planning of the mine and to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>A consequence analysis regarding the Pit Lake Containment Berm as well as the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke are currently being conducted and will be submitted with the Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA). This analysis will consider the potential effects on fish and fish habitat in the downstream environment. In addition, an assessment of the loss of containment of the Pit Lake on fisheries and freshwater habitat was presented in the EAC Application/EIS in Section 5.1.5.4.2.2.</p> <p>A Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan as a well as a Emergency Response Plan will be developed for the Proposed Project. An outline of these plans is presented in Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1646	434 - 57	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	In addition to the SCCA's concerns regarding fish and fish habitat, Glass Sponge Reefs have recently been discovered in Georgia Strait and Howe Sound. The unique, rare and "at risk" animals have been recognized by DFO with mandatory fishing closures around some of the reefs. The provincial government also recognized their global importance with the expansion of Halkett Marine Park (2016) at the southern tip of Gambier Island to protect the animals discovered there. Thorough surveys must be completed to determine their presence within 200m of the land-based project area and proposed barging route.	Comprehensive surveys for glass sponges were conducted within the subtidal footprint of the Proposed Project, including within 200 m of all marine infrastructure. This included systematic dive and towed video surveys in the depth ranges corresponding with known sponge reef occurrences in Howe Sound. No glass sponges were recorded during these surveys. The closest known individual glass sponges to the Proposed Project site are located on a subtidal rock wall (49.33.55 N, 123.22.66 W) approximately 1 km to the east of the barge load-out jetty, or approximately 100 to 150 m east of the outlet of McNab Creek (on the east side of the estuary), in water depths around -25 m depth chart datum (CD). This site is located within the Marine Resources LSA and RSA. The closest known sponge reefs (i.e., bioherms) to the BURNCO site are on the north side of the eastern Defence Island (49.34.67 N, 123.16.26 W - west side of Porteau sill, ) in water depths between -28 m and -35 m (CD). This site is approximately 9 km east of the proposed barge load-out jetty, and is located outside the Marine Resources LSA but within the RSA. The closest known sponge reefs to the proposed barging route occur at the entrance to Howe Sound (west of Passage Island in Queen Charlotte Channel), where two known sponge reef sites directly overlap with the proposed barging route in water depths ranging from -40 m to -120 m depth (CD). Both of these sites are located in the Marine Resources LSA and the RSA. Within Howe Sound, the proposed barging route also passes within 990 m of a known sponge reef in Ramillies Channel (in water depths of -20 to -30 m CD); as well as within 574 m of a known sponge reef in Thornbrough Channel (in-water depths of -150 to 160 m CD). Both sites are located outside the Marine Resources LSA but within the RSA.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1647	434 - 58	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>In conclusion, the SCCA disagrees with the current environmental impact assessment that the proposed Project will have negligible effects on Salmonidae and their habitats. It is our belief that the proponent's assessment is premature. At the least the following actions should be taken to create a more robust assessment:</p> <p>The baseline surveys of specific habitat requirements for of each of the salmon species (including Cutthroat and Steelhead Trout) need to be determined for each species' life cycle and across runs of different years in both freshwater and nearshore marine habitats. In addition, the water balance model based in part on the historic water flows of Chapman Creek (which had a different climate regime than McNab Creek is currently experiencing) should be calibrated with direct water flow measurements recorded over a number of years from McNab Creek itself to determine baseline conditions. Thirdly, it must be recognised that the meteorological effects of climate change are occurring now and must be factored into the water balance model and the climate infrastructure interactions with respect to fish and fish habitat.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. Specific issues have been responded to above.
1648	435 - 1	Valori McKay	Lions Bay, BC	I live on Howe Sound and recreate in and on the waters.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1649	435 - 2	Valori McKay	Lions Bay, BC	I oppose the loss of environment the gravel mine will create and the danger that increased shipping will cause to wildlife and humans both.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1650	435 - 3	Valori McKay	Lions Bay, BC	I live on Howe Sound and recreate in and on the waters. I oppose the loss of environment the gravel mine will create and the danger that increased shipping will cause to wildlife and humans both.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1651	436 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	I am opposed the the proposed McNab Creek mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1652	436 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	It will cause great harm to the ecosystem there while providing minimal jobs.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1653	436 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	It will cause great harm to the ecosystem there while providing minimal jobs.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1654	436 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	I think nature should win in this case.	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1655	437 - 1	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	I am absolutely shocked that the province would again be entertaining the reindustrialization of the Howe Sound when we have finally cleaned it up from the last man made environmental impacts. I quote the following from Common Sense Canadian advise you to seriously reconsider issuing any permission for this disastrous impact on the whole environment of the Howe Sound area. The area is not an industrial area and industry does not belong here for many more than the 10 reasons below, however I am just so applaud that we even need to remind the government again that this area is one of the biggest nature tourist generators for the province and KEEP INDUSTRY OUT as the impacts of this decision will be devastating on so many levels. Why should we care? Here, from the Future of Howe Sound Society fighting to protect the McNab Creek Valley, are ten very good reasons:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1656	437 - 2	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver's ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see "SuperNatural, British Columbia", how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1657	437 - 3	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1658	437 - 4	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1659	437 - 5	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1660	437 - 6	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1661	437 - 7	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1662	437 - 8	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1663	437 - 9	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1664	437 - 10	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco’s own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1665	437 - 11	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1666	437 - 12	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRDP noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1667	437 - 13	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1668	437 - 14	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
1669	437 - 15	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1670	437 - 16	Lisa Turpin	Lions Bay, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1671	438 - 1	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	I tried forwarding the criticisms detailed by Eoin Finn with which I fully agree but the Email address used was rejected. Why do Governments make communicating with them so difficult particularly for those not brought up in the computer age?	Eoin Finn's submissions are included and addressed in this tracking table (See Ref 608 and 632).
1672	438 - 2	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	The proposal to mine Mcnab Creek is a travesty.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1673	438 - 3	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is gradually recovering from assaults inflicted over the last 100 years, particularly the mining of copper and other metals at the Britannia mine site, serious mercury pollution in the Squamish area and the deposits of furans and dioxins generated by the Woodfibre Mill. Rehabilitation of Britannia Creek including an effective water treatment facility has resulted in returns of salmon and trout. The cost including ongoing maintenance, I understand, is in the order of 100 million dollars paid by the tax payers of this Province. And now we propose further assaults or death by a thousand cuts or maybe three. The first would be the Burnco proposal.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1674	438 - 4	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	This will involve noise and light pollution, damage to marine species and a significant increase in tug and barge traffic.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1675	438 - 5	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	This will involve noise and light pollution, damage to marine species and a significant increase in tug and barge traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1676	438 - 6	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	This will involve noise and light pollution, damage to marine species and a significant increase in tug and barge traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1677	438 - 7	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	This will involve noise and light pollution, damage to marine species and a significant increase in tug and barge traffic.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1678	438 - 8	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	In turn this will impact pinniped and whale species.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential changes in water, sediment and habitat quality from in-water works and propellor scour, and potential injury/mortality from in-water works, propellor scour and vessel strikes. Measures for mitigating potential effects from marine traffic on marine resources are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of potential residual effects on marine resources were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1679	438 - 9	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	All for the sake of 10 or 12 permanent jobs.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1680	438 - 10	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	The second will be the approved LNG plant at Woodfibre - again more marine traffic of substantially larger vessels - significantly detrimental to marine species.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1681	438 - 11	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	And the third would be the approval of Kinder Morgan's twinning of their pipeline into Vancouver. Any oil spill in this area of any size would be scandalous.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1682	438 - 12	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	You are aware that we have recently experienced recoveries of whales, dolphins, herring and now anchovy. Hake populations are strong, all of which bodes well for recreational users of the Sound and therein is its greatest value considering its proximity the Lower Mainland.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1683	438 - 13	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	It seems that Politicians are intent on the Re-industrialisation of Howe Sound. When will they view their decisions holistically?	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1684	438 - 14	B. P. Hanby	West Vancouver, BC	And will there be sufficient bonding provided by Burnco to repair the damage inflicted over the next 16 to 20 years or will the taxpayer again be on the hook?	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
1685	439 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Take a beautiful, alive and natural environment. Add an intensive gravel extraction operation. What is lost and what is gained? That is the trade-off the communities of Howe Sound are being asked to contemplate in reviewing the environmental assessment of the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1686	439 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I do not mind having new economic initiatives in this region, but I wonder what benefit the community (and region) at large would receive from this project.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1687	439 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	There has been a concerted effort of communities and citizens around Howe Sound to recover from previous industrialization. This region is a supernatural playground for Lower Mainlanders and visitors, right outside of the urban area. There have been developments in eco-tourism, with cycling routes and marine trails and campsites dotting Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1688	439 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The proposed activity would affect air quality in the region.	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1689	439 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The activity would create noise from 7am to 9 or 10 pm at least five days a week for twenty years.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1690	439 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	People have bought property or moved to this area for its recreational and wilderness environmental values. The proposal would take away those things to various degrees from impacted communities around the work site and along the path of the gravel barges as they move towards the Vancouver area.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1691	439 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The proposal would take away those things to various degrees from impacted communities around the work site and along the path of the gravel barges as they move towards the Vancouver area. The proponent must make clear how the affected communities would benefit from this project, especially in light of what would be lost by the presence of the project in this beautiful fjord.	BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.
1692	439 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The project should be required to submit the the Sunshine Coast Regional District noise bylaw.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1693	439 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The project should be required to use the most direct route to Vancouver, and not travel through Thornborough Channel.	Ramillies Channel is the preferred route. Thornbrough Channel is proposed only as an alternate, poor weather route.
1694	439 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The proponent should be required to take a serious look at the potential impacts of climate change upon the proposed lake and operations site.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1695	439 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The proponent must outline clearly what would be done to reclaim the site upon project completion, and how the outcomes would be monitored for success, and be required to post a bond to ensure reclamation of the site.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1696	439 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	The proponent must outline clearly what would be done to reclaim the site upon project completion, and how the outcomes would be monitored for success, and be required to post a bond to ensure reclamation of the site.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
1697	440 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Peachland, BC	This area must be protected because of wildlife, ocean life as well as environmental issues and also the enjoyment people get when they visit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1698	440 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Peachland, BC	This area must be protected because of wildlife, ocean life as well as environmental issues and also the enjoyment people get when they visit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1699	440 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Peachland, BC	This area must be protected because of wildlife, ocean life as well as environmental issues and also the enjoyment people get when they visit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1700	440 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Peachland, BC	It was said to be a natural park, we only have so very few.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1701	440 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Peachland, BC	Is the almighty \$\$\$ and greed so necessary to destroy one of the most important and beautiful areas in B.C.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1702	441 - 1	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	I am a life-long resident of Horseshoe Bay and have witnessed the pollution, degradation of the marine environment and thankfully the difficult clean up of Howe Sound.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1703	441 - 2	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Now as you are no doubt aware, the Orcas, Grey Whales, Dolphins, rock fish, salmon, herring and anchovies have returned.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1704	441 - 3	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	The tourism industry grows with every year and the demographics all around the sound have changed to young families, academics and small business people.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1705	441 - 4	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Now it seems that both the provincial and federal levels of government have decided to re-industrialize the sound in direct conflict to what the local residents, municipal governments and 10K signatures on a Declaration to protect Howe Sound have informed the politicians.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1706	441 - 5	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	I am absolutely opposed to the Burnco project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1707	441 - 6	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	It is not for the BC or Canadian Government to destroy the estuary of McNab Creek in order to add to Burnco's profit picture.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1708	441 - 7	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	This project has twice been rejected by Fisheries and Oceans Canada due to the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1709	441 - 8	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Even Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk, re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1710	441 - 9	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Since politicians no longer appear to care about our wildlife other than to use pictures of them to attract tourism and hunters, allow me to mention the fact that a very noisy, dusty gravel and crush mill is proposed to be sited next to an existing multi-residential area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1711	441 - 10	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Since politicians no longer appear to care about our wildlife other than to use pictures of them to attract tourism and hunters, allow me to mention the fact that a very noisy, dusty gravel and crush mill is proposed to be sited next to an existing multi-residential area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1712	441 - 11	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	The SCR D already said NO to this project in 2009. How many times will it come back. Until we are all too old to stand up to the politicians who practice corporate socialism?	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1713	441 - 12	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1714	441 - 13	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Why BC should help this company by allowing the McNab Creek strata title properties to be well within 500' of the proposed mining operations when generally gravel operations are not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
1715	441 - 14	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	Apparently there are no plans for air quality monitoring stations in the vicinity.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1716	441 - 15	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	And what about the noise? Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther and faster through water than through air and it will be terrible enough for the people living nearby.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1717	441 - 16	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory. Why were they not consulted.	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>
1718	441 - 17	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	The lobbyists always promote these projects as big job industries but apparently there will very few in this case. Why would you approve something that will cause so much negative impact merely to provide a profit for Burnco?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1719	441 - 18	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	I ask that you re-do the employment estimates and repost/all additional time for public scrutiny and comments.	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
1720	441 - 19	Mona Helcermanas-Benge	West Vancouver, BC	I urge that you reject the project and suggest that Burnco find another less damaging location away from Howe Sound.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1721	442 - 1	Rosemary Knight	Bowen Island, BC	My name is Dr. Rosemary Knight. I am a Professor in the School of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences at Stanford University, California, and a home-owner on Bowen Island. My address on Bowen Island is [redacted].	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1722	442 - 2	Rosemary Knight	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Burnco Aggregate Project McNab Creek.	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1723	442 - 3	Rosemary Knight	Bowen Island, BC	I am both a research scientist and an educator in the field of environmental sciences. After reviewing the proposal I have to conclude that it makes little sense to locate a gravel mine in this location. The impact on the estuary will be significant.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1724	442 - 4	Rosemary Knight	Bowen Island, BC	As an educator I find myself continually trying to explain to young people why we made the mistakes we did, and caused the environmental damage we did, over the past decades in our rush for economic development. My excuse/explanation is that we did not really understand the complexities of coupled water/vegetation/animal ecosystems. There is no longer this excuse. This project is something that might have been considered 20 years ago, before we came to understand the functioning of estuarine ecosystems. We now have the knowledge base, and as such, the responsibility to NOT allow such projects in environmentally sensitive areas like the McNab Creek estuary, that supports not only the species in the estuary, but also in the adjacent Howe Sound.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1725	442 - 5	Rosemary Knight	Bowen Island, BC	After the industrial mistakes of the past, Howe Sound is in recovery. The marine mammals have returned and we are all celebrating this recovery. Are you sure that this project will not have impacts on Howe Sound that will reverse this environmental success story? Are you sure that this is truly the best use of this land? Are you sure that you have good answers for the young people who will, if this project is approved, look at the destruction and ask – How could you – our provincial government – have allowed this to happen?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1726	443 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am deeply concerned about Burnco's proposed aggregate mine at McNab creek. The McNab Creek estuary is a fragile and important ecological area, home to salmon and at risk species such as Roosevelt Elk and 22 others identified by Burnco's own consultants. A mine in this location would destroy the local ecology and have impacts for the larger ecological area of Howe Sound, which is itself slowly recovering from past industrial pollution.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1727	443 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Herring populations are rising and bringing in whales that feed on the herring. A gravel mine would reverse these hard won advances to restore health to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1728	443 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	No economic argument for the mine is worth destroying this important habitat, especially when the only winner would be Burnco, and not the people of BC.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1729	443 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The very few jobs the mine would create do not justify the irreversible destruction of this land and they would be offset by a likely loss of jobs in other sectors such as ecotourism and recreation that depend on a healthy Howe Sound for their economic survival.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1730	443 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	While my primary concern is for the ecological integrity of this area, I understand there are also some residential lots near the proposed site and I am also concerned about the significant impacts the mine site would have on these people in terms of noise pollution, water pollution, decline in property values, and eyesores on the land.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
1731	443 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	While my primary concern is for the ecological integrity of this area, I understand there are also some residential lots near the proposed site and I am also concerned about the significant impacts the mine site would have on these people in terms of noise pollution, water pollution, decline in property values, and eyesores on the land.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 (Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.
1732	443 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	While my primary concern is for the ecological integrity of this area, I understand there are also some residential lots near the proposed site and I am also concerned about the significant impacts the mine site would have on these people in terms of noise pollution, water pollution, decline in property values, and eyesores on the land.	Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).  BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1733	443 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	While my primary concern is for the ecological integrity of this area, I understand there are also some residential lots near the proposed site and I am also concerned about the significant impacts the mine site would have on these people in terms of noise pollution, water pollution, decline in property values, and eyesores on the land.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Estates Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The McNab Strata viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater were the view would be unobstructed; this publically accessible location would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata.</p> <p>The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use. The assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions is limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exists are may be certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p> <p>BURNCO has committed to establishing a mutually agreeable mechanism for engaging with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of benefit and concern.</p>
1734	443 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am asking you to not approve this mine in this location. I am asking you to please think of the long term health of the land, of Howe Sound and of the wider net of economic activity in the area that depends upon a clean Howe Sound. Thank you for your consideration and, what I hope will be a thoughtful, wise decision to not grant approval to this development	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1735	444 - 1	Len Gilday	Bowen Island, BC	I live in Howe Sound, on Bowen Island, and have rejoiced as orcas, herrings, salmon and other species have made a slow recovery in their former homelands. The proposed McNab Creek gravel mine will put too all this at risk. Please do not approve this project. It is the wrong plan in the wrong place at the wrong time. It's wrong.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1736	445 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>While looking at the Burnco references and personal communications cited in the EAC Application/EIS, I notice a reference to myself [redacted]: Dietrich, S. 2014. 4.5 Acres Zoned for 2 Waterfront cabins on Gambier Island. Available at: <a href="http://www.gambierislandlotforsale.com/">http://www.gambierislandlotforsale.com/</a>. Accessed 24 Jul 2014. 21-48</p> <p>I have no idea what they are referencing in the sustainable economy section! All I know is that I have been trying to sell a 4.5 acre waterfront lot within the Douglas Bay community for a few years now. The lot has a direct view of McNab Valley and the local realtor is suggesting that the reason it is not selling is because of the proposed Burnco project. In one of the most heated real estate markets that Vancouver and the surrounding areas has ever seen, I can't seem to attract more than \$200,000 for this prime property oceanfront lot. The value seems to be less than I paid for it in 2007. If it were located anywhere else the piece would have easily doubled by now.</p> <p>The real issue here is that there are so many references in the document that most of them will never be reviewed and they likely have no bearing on anything substantially related to the the Burnco project.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1737	446 - 1	Cathryn Robertson	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Estuaries are needed for the salmon and the bears.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1738	446 - 2	Cathryn Robertson	Bowen Island, BC	Estuaries are needed for the salmon and the bears.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1739	446 - 3	Cathryn Robertson	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The reindustrializaion of Howe Sound, a marine treasure is not forward thinking. The future of this site will be destroyed for generations, never to be an estuary in a fiord again, ever.</p> <p>Howe sound has the return of anchovies, humpback whales, orcas, mackeral and bears. Please do not destroy for a gravel mine with the resulting pit.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1740	446 - 4	Cathryn Robertson	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The future of this site will be destroyed for generations, never to be an estuary in a fiord again, ever. Howe sound has the return of anchovies, humpback whales, orcas, mackeral and bears. Please do not destroy for a gravel mine with the resulting pit.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1741	446 - 5	Cathryn Robertson	Bowen Island, BC	Please do not destroy for a gravel mine with the resulting pit.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1742	447 - 1	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The Proposed Burnco Proposed Aggregate Project at McNab Creek in Howe Sound will lead to Land and Marine Environmental, Health, Economic, Social and Heritage degradation :	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway. Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
1743	447 - 2	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	1.Environmental: Acid drainage, which is a bi-product of rock crushing will harm the prawn and scallop beds in front of the McNab Creek estuary and harm the salmon species within the estuary, from spawning successfully. Rock crushing releases sulphites that immediately mix with oxygen to become toxic acid drainage, which creates an unconscionable risk to sealife and is a retrograde step in the decades long recovery process.	Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.  Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material's potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.  The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.
1744	447 - 3	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	2.Health Effects: Rock Crushing Dust creates fine particulate airborne waste that will enter and line the human lung. This poses a significant harm to human health and one assumes a risk to the health of both animal and sea life. The Vancouver Aquarium is actively charting the recovery of Howe Sound.	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1745	447 - 4	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	2.Health Effects: Rock Crushing Dust creates fine particulate airborne waste that will enter and line the human lung. This poses a significant harm to human health and one assumes a risk to the health of both animal and sea life. The Vancouver Aquarium is actively charting the recovery of Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1746	447 - 5	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	3.Economic, Mammal and Human Health, along with Social Effects: Noise will echo through the Howe Sound similar to the fog horns. The difference is that it will invade the serenity and harm the economy as a result.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1747	447 - 6	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	In addition, this noise level will likely be a deterrent to marine mammals who have returned following several decades of recovery efforts in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1748	447 - 7	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent cleaning up Howe Sound from the Federal and Provincial Government and business such as Howe Sound Pulp and Paper. Those businesses who did not clean up, did not survive the world's scrutiny that demands responsible business stewardship.</p> <p>This project represents IRRESPONSIBLE environmental, social, heritage, health and economic stewardship. It is a very poor business decision for the Province of BC.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1749	447 - 8	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>4.Economic Effects: The visual vistas that Howe Sound presents is our Canadian and British Columbian right. Stanley Park would also have gravel and we would not consider mining Stanley Park. Howe Sound is a world renowned spectacular tourist attractant to Canada, British Columbia, and the Lower Mainland. Even if there was gold in Stanley Park, we would not mine it, as Stanley Park, like Howe Sound is the gold.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1750	447 - 9	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>5.The 'Environment is the Economy' in Howe Sound: The Shell Fish Industry, the Film Industry, Tourism [fishing, power and sail boating, paddle boarding, kayaking], Cruise Ships, and Hiking with spectacular vistas and auditory serenity. These are family supporting jobs, requiring boats, life jackets, fishing rods, paddle boards, kayaks, fishing boats, cruise ships, film crews, actors.</p> <p>The vistas bring people from all over the world who home office which brings industry through jobs to Howe Sound from all over the world with Tax filings in BC. 2010 Olympics aftermath benefits economically with the Sea to Sky Corridor as the No.1 rated scenic highway in the world, attracting TV advertisers, movies, and high income earners worldwide to drive and 'view' Howe Sound on the Sea to Sky Highway and travel to Whistler.</p> <p>The Sea to Sky Highway is the No.2 Tourist Attraction only second to Stanley Park for Vancouver. The Museum of Anthropology is No.3, Granville Island is No. 9.</p> <p>Our BC Ferries, rightfully brag about the spectacular vistas including whales and dolphins in British Columbia's Howe Sound; both whales and dolphins were seen in Howe Sound today, Monday, October 7th, 2013.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1751	447 - 10	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	6.Heritage: The First Nations Heritage must be considered and protected, as this is a location of great importance and prominence in Canada to the First Nations Heritage with the Squamish Nation.	<p>Potential effects on Aboriginal Interest, including current use, are presented in Part C of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal interests were assessed for the following Aboriginal Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Squamish Nation</li> <li>- Tseil-Waututh Nation</li> <li>- Musqueam Indian Band</li> <li>- Stz'uminus First Nation</li> <li>- Cowichan Tribes</li> <li>- Lyackson First Nation</li> <li>- Penelakut Tribe</li> <li>- Metis Nation British Columbia</li> </ul> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal rights, including current use of lands and resources, were identified for the Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation. Mitigation proposed is designed to address these potential effects.</p> <p>Both of these groups are participating in the EA review as members of the Technical Working Group.</p> <p>BURNCO is engaged in ongoing discussions on the Proposed Project with the Squamish Nation and the Tselil-Waututh Nation about commitments and processes for addressing their specific concerns, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access management for marine and terrestrial harvesting activities</li> <li>- marine use planning</li> <li>- ongoing involvement in environmental management and monitoring activities, and</li> <li>- ensuring the long-term ecological function of McNab Creek.</li> </ul>
1752	447 - 11	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	7.Environment: The Harvey Creek in Lions Bay, Howe Sound, BC, has fish spawning for the first time in 2013; Furry Creek is now full of fish spawning; Britannia Mine was the largest point source of pollution in North America and now has fish in close proximity. Howe Sound is becoming a 'Mecca' for sea life, fresh air and is generating \$Billions of Tax Revenue both directly and indirectly as the spectacular corridor to the Resort Municipality of Whistler.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1753	447 - 12	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>8. Environmental and Social: McNab Creek estuary is a tourism mecca...of paddle boards, cruise ships pass McNab Creek estuary, 3 yacht clubs, many children and family summer camps [many for the underprivileged]; iconic of 'Spectacular British Columbia'. McNab Creek is the 'Mother's Lap' of Howe Sound. McNab Creek is iconic for British Columbians...at the lap of the snow capped mountains...where your eye naturally falls, always when taking in the breathtaking vistas, you are looking at McNab Creek.</p> <p>As Howe Sound is a 'coliseum' you cannot say that if you were swimming at water level you would not see this mine, as it will be seen by every passerby, whether by boat, ferry, on the Sea to Sky Corridor or by the frequently seen paddle boards at McNab Creek ~ the mine will be seen due to the 'coliseum' natural geography from the surrounding mountain terrain.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1754	447 - 13	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>9. Economy and Social: Gravel comes from Mountains and can be found anywhere in BC, thus this project is very unneeded and unnecessary. In the 1980's there was a serious proposal to Open Pit Mine Gambier Island. Had this gone forward Gambier Island would appear to be a volcano and with European opposition, it is very unlikely that BC would have had the opportunity to host the 2010 Olympics.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1755	447 - 14	Brenda Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Our values as British Columbians with regard to spectacular Howe Sound with McNab Creek as the 'Mother's Lap', have now been secured and cemented,unifying us all with one voice ~ preserve and protect our precious, our beautiful, British Columbian's world class and beloved Howe Sound...the most southerly fjord in North America ! We have worked toward recovery with mammoth effort over decades of time and many successful assertions of the environmental respect that it must be provided. This is British Columbia's jewel, playground to 2 million urbanites at their doorstep...what has this yielded...the first sustainability Olympics in history; a growing economy, that compliments the values of the Lower Mainland and acts as the doorway to Whistler's economy; environmental stewardship at a worldclass level; sail boarding, dolphins, whales, salmon, paddle boarding, kayaking, sailing, boating, cruising, film, TV, advertising...McNab Creek is a vital estuary and centre piece in our now thriving Howe Sound...we would be irresponsible to act against these long standing initiatives, that have led to outstanding outcomes...this is the economy, that supports the reason that Mandalay made its first feature film in BC rather than in the southern US ~ Howe Sound was the reason.</p> <p>McNab Creek, as one of only 3 estuaries in Howe Sound and as the visual 'Mother's Lap' of Howe Sound is integral to responsible stewardship and must be treated with care and protection for the economic, environmental, social, heritage and health benefits to us all in the Lower Mainland, British Columbia and Canada.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1756	448 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>JUDGING FROM ALL THE COMMENTS RECEIVED, I THINK IT'S FAIRLY CLEAR THAT MORE THAN 99% OF OUR LOCALS, AND OTHERS WHO HAVE VISITED THIS AREA, FROM ALL AROUND THE WORLD, ARE AGAINST THIS RIDICULOUS PROJECT. (MAY I REMIND YOU, FOR THE 3RD TIME) THEREFORE YOU HAVE NO REASON OR SOCIAL LICENCE TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT. IT WOULD BE A TOTAL TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1757	448 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>WE DO NOT NEED MORE NOISE, POLLUTION, EXTINCTION OF FISH HABITAT, HAVING TO WEAR DUST MASKS TO STOP EXTREMELY DANGEROUS CHRYSTALLINE SILICA MATERIALS ENTERING OUR LUNGS IN ORDER TO LIVE HERE DAY BY DAY. WILL FREE RESPIRATORS BE PROVIDED BY THIS COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT IF THIS PROJECT GOES AHEAD??</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1758	448 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	WE DO NOT NEED MORE NOISE, POLLUTION, EXTINCTION OF FISH HABITAT, HAVING TO WEAR DUST MASKS TO STOP EXTREMELY DANGEROUS CHRYSTALLINE SILICA MATERIALS ENTERING OUR LUNGS IN ORDER TO LIVE HERE DAY BY DAY. WILL FREE RESPIRATORS BE PROVIDED BY THIS COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT IF THIS PROJECT GOES AHEAD??	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1759	448 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	WE DO NOT NEED MORE NOISE, POLLUTION, EXTINCTION OF FISH HABITAT, HAVING TO WEAR DUST MASKS TO STOP EXTREMELY DANGEROUS CHRYSTALLINE SILICA MATERIALS ENTERING OUR LUNGS IN ORDER TO LIVE HERE DAY BY DAY. WILL FREE RESPIRATORS BE PROVIDED BY THIS COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT IF THIS PROJECT GOES AHEAD??	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1760	448 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	WE DO NOT NEED MORE NOISE, POLLUTION, EXTINCTION OF FISH HABITAT, HAVING TO WEAR DUST MASKS TO STOP EXTREMELY DANGEROUS CHRYSTALLINE SILICA MATERIALS ENTERING OUR LUNGS IN ORDER TO LIVE HERE DAY BY DAY. WILL FREE RESPIRATORS BE PROVIDED BY THIS COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT IF THIS PROJECT GOES AHEAD??	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1761	448 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	WE DO NOT NEED MORE NOISE, POLLUTION, EXTINCTION OF FISH HABITAT, HAVING TO WEAR DUST MASKS TO STOP EXTREMELY DANGEROUS CHRYSTALLINE SILICA MATERIALS ENTERING OUR LUNGS IN ORDER TO LIVE HERE DAY BY DAY. WILL FREE RESPIRATORS BE PROVIDED BY THIS COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT IF THIS PROJECT GOES AHEAD??	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1762	449 - 1	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>I have attended open houses, presentations and reviewed the application on this Project.</p> <p>I appreciate that Burnco has done their utmost to mitigate risks towards a sustainable project. However, I believe that, cummulatively, the risks outweigh the benefits and cannot support the Project.</p> <p>I submit and concur with the specifics and attached comments.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1763	449 - 2	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1764	449 - 3	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1765	449 - 4	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1766	449 - 5	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1767	449 - 6	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1768	449 - 7	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1769	449 - 8	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
1770	449 - 9	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1771	449 - 10	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
1772	449 - 11	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1773	449 - 12	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1774	449 - 13	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1775	449 - 14	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1776	449 - 15	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1777	449 - 16	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1778	449 - 17	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1779	449 - 18	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
1780	449 - 19	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
1781	449 - 20	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1782	449 - 21	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
1783	449 - 22	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1784	449 - 23	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1785	449 - 24	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
1786	449 - 25	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1787	449 - 26	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1788	449 - 27	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1789	449 - 28	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
1790	449 - 29	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1791	449 - 30	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1792	450 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to you in opposition to the wet gravel mine proposed for McNab Creek by Burnco.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1793	450 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Why would anyone mine an estuary in an area (Howe Sound) that is still recovering from earlier industrialization?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1794	450 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	This entire area, is the recreational area for Vancouver and the Lower Mainland, as such, has high tourism and ecological value.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1795	450 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Because of intensive post-industrial remediation, we who live in Howe Sound are seeing the return of herring and anchovies and large mammals such as dolphins, sea lions and whales.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1796	450 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that a small population of elk have been re-established near McNab Creek and will be affected by a mine. Other indigenous animals will be cut off by the mine from the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1797	450 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Please, for all our sakes, turn down this application for a gravel mine on this important habitat. Why would the province bother doing all the costly remediation work of Britannia Mines and other industrial sites to turn around and undo it by approving this proposal? Thank you for your careful and attentive work protecting our home.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1798	451 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	FROM THE PEOPLE IN LIONS BAY AND HOWE SOUND, WHO LIVE , WORK, AND BREATHE IN THE FRESH AIR HERE, WHO HAVE CHILDREN AND GRAND-CHILDREN HERE, WE WILL NOT ALLOW OUT BEAUTIFUL HOWE SOUND TO BE POLLUTED BY A GRAVEL MINING OPERATION WHICH HAS NO USE HERE.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1799	452 - 1	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The people of Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky region are values driven and have devoted time, money and energy to the clean up and remediation of Howe Sound, polluted and denigrated by poor industrial practice. To consider re-industrializing an area which has established itself as a destination for eco-tourism is unconscionable ....	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1800	452 - 2	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	12 jobs and ultimately a 76 acre gravel extraction lake makes no sense... The Sea to Sky Gondola employees dozens of employees, there are 12 employees at the Lions Bay General Store and Café, dozens more in Sewell's adventure boats bring excited, inspired and awestruck tourists to the beauty of Howe Sound, offering a complete ecosystem from healthy water for salmon to return to all the way to the spectacle of Orca's and larger whales breaching, fishing, and frolicking in Howe Sound.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
1801	452 - 3	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky corridor is the playground and the oxygen of the lower mainland. To have an outdoor wonderland within minutes of a major metropolitan area is the envy of the world, and this must be protected. Major, predominantly high-tech and future leaning firms that can establish virtually anywhere are coming to Greater Vancouver because their employees are values driven, they seek clean air, a healthy lifestyle, and quality life experiences for themselves and for their children. These are provided and supported by the Sea to Sky corridor.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1802	452 - 4	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	This project is not needed to support our local or provincial economy, is destructive to other initiatives that support the reality that "the environment is the economy" and flies in the face of all the incredible work done by so many to restore the health and beauty of the region.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1803	452 - 5	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	Sustainability has been described as a three legged stool, with economic, environmental and social augmented by cultural as a fourth component. This project is not sustainable, it fails on all four elements. The project takes more from than it gives the economy of the region, is environmentally irresponsible, and provides nothing and is destructive to the social and cultural fabric of our region.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1804	452 - 6	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	When the Village of Lions Bay gravel pit was in operation during the building of the Sea to Sky Highway Upgrade prior to 2010, the mining of the Lions Bay 'Brunswick' gravel pit could be heard across long distances within the community regularly. This noise created a regular disruption for many residents, both above and below and surrounding spanning distances well in excess of 500'.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1805	452 - 7	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	There is gravel all over BC. It is egregious to consider mining in one of 3 estuaries in the most southerly fjord in North America. This is simply irresponsible. It takes away much needed jobs from its current gravel mining location in Port McNeill, and will take away jobs in the boating and eco-tourism industry in Howe Sound. This would be economically irresponsible.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1806	452 - 8	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	As owner/operator of the Lions Bay General Store & Café, visitors from all over the world, comment daily on the beauty and pristine nature of Howe Sound, Howe Sound has been the 'driveway entrance' to Whistler but in recent years Squamish and the Squamish region has become the destination for outdoor adventure and tourism. The Sea to Sky Gondola has been an incredible draw and success in highlighting the beauty of Howe Sound. Tourists and locals alike no longer see the Sea to Sky Highway as a roadway to someplace else but as a destination and experience itself. This is Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1807	452 - 9	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1808	452 - 10	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised. For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a time span to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.	Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.  Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.
1809	452 - 11	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine").	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
1810	452 - 12	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine").	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1811	452 - 13	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed "compensation channel" is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for loss should be automatic.	Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.  Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1812	452 - 14	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta.	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
1813	452 - 15	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1814	452 - 16	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1815	452 - 17	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1816	452 - 18	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1817	452 - 19	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs. BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses in those areas) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>
1818	452 - 20	Michael Broughton	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The EAO process provides the proponent the opportunity to address the concerns identified by the public in October 2013. This is unfortunate. They are saying less fish will die, they will screen more of the visual devastation, they will try to fix what they damage..... all of these responses are unacceptable in that the project is in the wrong place and is unacceptable as a concept for the region. The premise is wrong, it is unacceptable, in the wrong place, and no amount of mitigation will make it acceptable.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A -Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1819	453 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	The Burnco Aggregate Project proposed for McNab Creek area will seriously conflict with all the efforts of the past decades to nurse Howe Sound back to health. As a resident of Howe Sound I enjoy all the wildlife and the physical beauty of the sound and am dead against this project.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1820	454 - 1	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	Whenever we have visitors from out of town, we take them to Howe Sound to enjoy the spectacular beauty of the area. All of them are amazed that such a pristine and beautiful area exists so close to a major city. We have seen dramatic improvements in the marine ecosystem in the past ten years, can't believe this and the unspoiled scenery would be put at risk by a gravel pit.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1821	454 - 2	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	It's time we protected and promoted our beautiful environment rather than despoiling it.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1822	454 - 3	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	Protect the McNabb Creek Fish run, the Elk habitat, and the future supernatural tourism potential of Howe Sound.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1823	454 - 4	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	Protect the McNabb Creek Fish run, the Elk habitat, and the future supernatural tourism potential of Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1824	454 - 5	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	Protect the McNabb Creek Fish run, the Elk habitat, and the future supernatural tourism potential of Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1825	454 - 6	Carolyn Philip	New Westminster, BC	No to a gravel pit at McNabb Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1826	455 - 1	Jackie Raymond	Vancouver, BC	Our family owns property on Gambier Island overlooking the propose Burnco site, this could not only be detrimental to Howe Sounds marine life but to the beauty that this area possesses. We have waiting decades for the marine life to come back to the Howe Sound, please reconsider this proposition!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1827	456 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	McNab Creek estuary is a very special place.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1828	456 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	In fact, all of Howe Sound is a naturally spectacular place that should be preserved as a International Heritage Site.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1829	456 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	This is no place for a gravel pit. The long term economic benefits derived from eco tourism would far surpass any benefit from the gravel pit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1830	456 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	I have serious concerns that the environment assessment was not completed correctly and I urge you to not allow this proposed gravel pit to proceed.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1831	457 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN DENIED TWICE BEFORE. HAVING SPENT BILLIONS OF TAX PAYERS DOLLARS TO CLEAN UP OUR SOUND AFTER COPPER MINE AND WOODFIBRE DISASTERS WHY WOULD YOU EVEN THINK, OR ALLOW A GRAVEL PIT TO BE ALLOWED HERE...YOU WOULD BE COMPLETE IDIOTS TO DO SO AND WILL HAVE A LOT OF QUESTIONS AS TO WHY YOU ARE NOT PROTECTING OUR SALMON, HERRING, SPOT PRAWNS ETC.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1832	458 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This letter is being submitted regarding your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products's proposed open pit mine at the McNab Creek estuary.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1833	458 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This letter is being submitted as a result of your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products regarding its proposal for an open pit mine at McNabb Creek. While we have significant concerns that this is a highly flawed and biased process, we have no option but to “play the game” and “trust in the process”.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1834	458 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Burnco Rock Product's (Burnco's) proposed, large, open-pit aggregate mine and crushing facility is clearly contrary to regional commitments and development efforts in the area, and more importantly it is completely inconsistent with the established use of the area for primarily leisure purposes.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1835	458 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1836	458 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1837	458 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The proposed open pit mine should not be considered in isolation. The cumulative impact of other projects in the area need to form part of this assessment. In May 2015 the Auditor General of BC issued a report with nine recommendations and stated "it's in the interest of British Columbians to address cumulative effects management without delay" Howe Sound was selected as one of the Province's first regions for Cumulative Effects Assessment under the new framework.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1838	458 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>While the economic return will accrue to Burnco and a small number of local businesses, significant socio-economic costs and environmental damage to Howe Sound will be borne by the communities and residents of the area and the taxpayers of British Columbia who will derive little benefit from the project. The mine will generate only 12 full time jobs at around \$25/hr, similar to a less experienced construction worker. The aggregate itself may well replace aggregate from other parts of BC and thus the jobs may not be "net new" employment but rather "replacement employment", there is no benefit in this.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
1839	458 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Environmental Impacts</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1840	458 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1841	458 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1842	458 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1843	458 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>In fact, Oceans and Fisheries Canada (aka DFO) has already rejected such proposals in the past. With respect to the Burnco project, In June of 2010, DFO determined that the project would result in harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (“HADD”) of fish habitat that cannot be compensated elsewhere in the Sound. As such DFO advised Burnco that DFO was not prepared to issue a HADD authorization.</p> <p>In response, I understand Burnco filed a judicial review application against DFO in Supreme Court. Subsequently, DFO agreed to participate in a full environmental review. However, in June, 2011, DFO issued a letter in which they stated that they “continue to have serious concerns about the extent of the impacts to fish and fish habitat that may result from this project” and that “The project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat.”</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1844	458 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1845	458 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1846	458 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1847	458 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1848	458 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1849	458 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>A 2012 research project by Vancouver Aquarium found that the foreshore area directly in front of the proposed project is a marine rich habitat and an important and rare nursery area for various aquatic habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1850	458 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Burnco's Consultant's, Golder and Associates, clearly show in their assessments dust blooms extending far out to sea which over the 16 years of this projects lifetime will cause harmful silt and sediment build up across the foreshore area. The extent of these dust blooms directly contradict other Golder assurances that spraying mitigations will eliminate such dust blooms in the first place. Clearly Golder needs to do further work to get reconcile their opinions.</p> <p>The area can be very exposed to extreme wind conditions which are difficult to predict and monitor. The proponents air quality report shows particulate matter over the marine environment but the marine assessment contradicts this by saying there will be no sediment seems a little incongruous. We need to ensure that should the project go ahead this particulate matter is evaluated on a continuous basis both through air quality monitoring and monitoring of the marine ecosystems around the project. A build-up of silt in the marine environment cannot be allowed, over the course of the project it would destroy local marine life.</p>	<p>The air quality dispersion model predictions presented in Figures 5.7-2, 5.7-3, 5.7-4 and 5.7-5 represent in-air concentrations of particulate matter fractions and not predictions of dust deposition; the concentrations presented do not represent dust plumes. In addition, the dispersion modelling methods and associated assumptions - approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) - incorporated a high degree of conservatism. The air dispersion model was based on worst case daily emission rates and assumed worst case daily emissions every day of the year. These assumptions contributed to the high level of confidence in the air quality assessment predictions that there will no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The same Ministry-approved CALPUFF model that was used to predict air quality concentrations (i.e., run in dynamic [3D] mode with a fine resolution meteorological data set) was used to predict deposition rates which were incorporated into the surface water quality model and the assessment of potential effects on water quality and aquatic health. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1851	458 - 20	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Golder Associates also indicate the site could be home to up to 21 Species at Risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk that were transplanted to McNab Creek by the BC Ministry of Environment in 2001 in an effort to re-introduce the species to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1852	458 - 21	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The current value of the McNabb area as salmon bearing habitat is downplayed in the proponent's report. Our own experience has been of a rejuvenation in fish stocks at McNab, reflecting the fish recovery seen elsewhere in Howe Sound. Greater scrutiny around this part of the report is necessary to reflect the true value of the creek as a salmon habitat.	<p>A description and quantification of potential spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 is provided in section 3.1.3.1 of Appendix 5.1-A and in Table 6 of the same appendix. A spawner survey conducted on 13 November 2016 re-affirmed the baseline description and observed less than 200 m2 of suitable salmonid spawning habitat based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth (&gt; 18cm).</p> <p>As described in section 3.1.3.2 of Appendix 5.1-A the lower section of WC2 consists of low gradient run and pool habitat with exposed gravels present in the runs and fines occurring in the pool areas. The distribution of pool to run habitat is approximately 1/1 along the length of the lower section. There is approximately 3,920 m2 of wetted area in the lower section of WC2 suggesting that there is approximately 1960 m2 of run habitat that may be suitable for spawning, based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth. During the 13 November 2016 spawner survey chum salmon were observed to be spawning in the available run habitat present in the lower section of the channel (Figure 1, 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat).</p> <p>The Fish Habitat Offset Plan proposes to create more than 5,000 m2 of additional groundwater-fed channel habitat with approximately a 1/1 ration of pool to run habitat. The offset channel extension uses the design of the existing lower channel as a template so it is reasonable to expected that approximately 2,500 m2 of the new habitat will have conditions similar to the run habitat present in the existing channel where chum salmon were observed to be spawning.</p> <p>A 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat provides the results of 2016 spawner surveys for WC2 and a description of salmonid species utilization of habitat provided by groundwater-fed channels.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1853	458 - 22	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Even if Burnco make the best possible effort, there is no way they will be able to significantly mitigate the noise from loading millions of tonnes of aggregate into steel hulled barges. Noise and vibrations have been found to disturb large marine mammals' communication, navigation and food-finding abilities, and are increasingly believed to impact their fertility. Sadly, if Burnco is allowed to proceed with this mine, we can expect the dolphins, orcas, and grey whales to vacate the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1854	458 - 23	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	An artificial lake is not a reasonable remediation to replace the habitat for the displaced wildlife.	<p>The pit lake is not proposed as mitigation for habitat loss. Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
1855	458 - 24	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	We find it difficult to believe that there will be no audible impact from the project on the north end of Gambier Island. Given the natural topography of the area and the fact that noise travels very clearly across water we have significant concerns about the noise of the barge loading in particular which we believe will have a significant negative impact of the peaceful nature of the area for humans as well as for marine and terrestrial life. While talking to representatives from Golder at the Open House in West Vancouver in September 2016 it became clear that the noise impact had been modelled with little firsthand knowledge of the area impacted; the lead representative on noise impact admitted he had never been onsite.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1856	458 - 25	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The noise values expected from the Golder models were considered to be acceptable to urban and industrial settings; the study area is neither as it is primarily recreational.	The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: "A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment."  McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.
1857	458 - 26	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1858	458 - 27	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1859	458 - 28	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>A number of areas of the EIS identify possible environmental impacts of the project but allude to these being addressed by “best management practices”. There are significant concerns around approving a development with clear environmental risks based on the “hope” that best environmental practices will be adhered to. The resources available at the BCEAO for oversight of such projects seem fairly limited from a resource perspective (5-6 people cover the province). What is to stop the proponent from ignoring “best practise” and declining to follow mitigation strategies? The experience of residents adjacent to the Cougar Ridge Mine in Calgary, Alberta owned and operated by Burnco does not suggest that Burnco can be guaranteed to be a “good neighbour”.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1860	458 - 29	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Economic Impacts</p> <p>While the project will create 12 full time jobs, it will jeopardize far more jobs than that by impacting the tourism and film industries irreparably.</p> <p>BC FILM INDUSTRY</p> <p>The BC Film industry contributes \$1.3 billion annually to the BC economy. Crews regularly use Howe Sound to represent many world locales, as it provides the key ingredients of wilderness, breathtaking scenery, and easy access from Vancouver, and silence. The introduction of an open pit mine, gravel barge and crusher will dramatically diminish this appeal—making Vancouver itself a less convenient place to film a movie, since its nearby wilderness will no longer be viable for filming.</p> <p>In a 2012 letter to the Future of Howe Sound Society (FHSS) from Thierry Tanguy, a Unit and Location Manager, in Greater Vancouver's Film Industry, Thierry had this to say: "In the last few years, a number of projects have been filmed in the Squamish corridor, as opposed to the other regions we typically compete with, such as California and Louisiana, precisely because of the pristine beauty of its coastline. To name a specific example, I just finished working on a project entitled 'Horns' for Mandalay Pictures. ... originally slated to be filmed in Savannah, Georgia. The one element that shifted the interest in favour of British Columbia is the beauty of the Squamish corridor and Howe Sound where we ended up filming Two-Thirds of the project. This is Twenty-Million</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1861	458 - 30	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The mine will be visible from the Cypress ski area and Lions Bay, a popular hiking and rock-climbing destination. Every visitor headed to Squamish or Whistler on the Sea-to-Sky Highway and Sea-to-Sky Gondola, as well as daily sightseeing flights from downtown on Harbour Air and others, will see this once-stunning valley being rendered into a gravel mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1862	458 - 31	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p><b>Property Values</b> Property values along the Howe Sound have already been negatively impacted. The 16 vacation homes at McNab Creek and 53 recreational properties directly across the channel at Douglas Bay on Gambier Island will be the hardest hit due to the obvious eyesore, increased barge traffic, noise and loss of natural beauty. The reduction in property values which has already occurred since the mine was first proposed 6 years ago, harms not only residents, but municipal governments' tax base. Given the considerable increases in property values in the Lower Mainland in the last 6 years it is quite staggering that properties anywhere close to this proposed mine have seen a decline in both assessed value and potential resale value, as evidenced by recent land sales in the area.</p> <p>Vancouver-based Burrard and West Vancouver-based Thunderbird Yacht Clubs have outstations directly opposite the mine site. The 600 members will suffer loss of land value, and outstations will suffer from significantly diminished use.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
1863	458 - 32	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p><b>Social Impacts</b> Easy accessibility from Vancouver allows people across the lower mainland to enjoy wilderness on their doorstep. The impact of the mine will diminish Howe Sound for present and future generations, reducing Vancouver's much-vaunted "liveability."</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1864	458 - 33	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The immediate visual impact of the mine and crushing facilities has only been shown by the proponent at sea level. To understand the full visual impact an assessment from a higher elevation is needed. We believe that from a higher elevation the open pit mine and crushing facilities will be fully visible and have a further negative social and economic impact on the properties from which they are visible.</p>	<p>The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed, and it is a publically accessible location that would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata. The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use.</p> <p>Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1865	458 - 34	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	In the immediate vicinity of this proposed mine there are existing communities including McNab Creek Strata, Douglas Bay Strata, Brigade Bay, Burrard Yacht Club and Thunderbird Yacht Club. All of these communities enjoy the peace and tranquillity and abundant wildlife in this amazing section of Howe Sound. Families engage in all manner of sport and recreation including hiking, swimming, water sports, sailing, wind surfing, paddle boarding and kayaking. In addition numerous kids camps such as Potlach, Day Break, Artaban, Boys and Girls Club use this area for recreation and there are frequent excursions of kayakers in procession from these camps paddling by or visiting McNab Creek area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1866	458 - 35	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	In its draft AIR Burnco committed to reporting on the status of consultations with private local land owners and tenure holders who will be affected by the project. However Volume 4, section 21 of the report shows little evidence that Burnco fulfilled these commitments. At section 21.2.4.1 – Social Communications the list of Personal Communications lacks engagement with the local stakeholders who will be impacted by the project. For instance, although Douglas Bay is the largest private land holding in the area and will be directly impacted if the project goes ahead no one from Burnco has attempted to contact the members of the Douglas Bay Strata.	The sample of key informants described in Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS (Non-traditional Land and Resource Use) was not intended to be exhaustive of all stakeholders potentially affected by the Proposed Project, but rather was intended to be wide ranging enough to confirm and expand on non-traditional land and resource use information available from the referenced secondary sources. Key informants interviewed or provided data for this report included representatives from recreational groups and tourism operators, as well as DFO and MFLNRO. Specifically key informants included:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Burrard Yacht Club</li> <li>- Coastal Inlet Adventures</li> <li>- DFO</li> <li>- Don's Water Taxi</li> <li>- Gambier Island Local Trust</li> <li>- Gibson Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>- Islands Trust</li> <li>- MFLNRO</li> <li>- Recreation Sites and Trails BC</li> <li>- Sewell's Marina</li> <li>- Squamish Yacht Club</li> <li>- Sunshine Kayaks</li> <li>- Thunderbird Yacht Club</li> </ul> Conditions C-5.1 through C-5.3 (Table 19.1) outlines the Proponent commitment to ongoing engagement with the McNab Creek Strata. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. BURNCO has also proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1867	458 - 36	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	In conclusion we cannot see how the joint goals of environmental, social and economic sustainability for Howe Sound can be achieved if this project is allowed to go ahead. We can only trust in the process and believe that our public servants and government will recognize that the value of McNab Creek and the whole Howe Sound region outweighs the business needs of one Alberta based company.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1868	458 - 37	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	If the project should go ahead we need to ensure that there are stringent conditions (including multi-million dollar environmental bonds) attached to its approval which are closely monitored on an ongoing basis by an independent third party and to ensure that the scope of the operation does not extend beyond that described in the EIS. A robust monitoring and safeguard system needs to be in place to ensure the commitments in this application are followed through and that Burnco is held accountable should the need arise.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1869	458 - 38	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Finally we suggest that Burnco is required to grant restrictive covenants in favour of the landowners surrounding the proposed project to ensure that the commitments and assurances given in the approval process are effectively monitored and enforced.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
1870	459 - 1	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	This letter is being submitted regarding your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products's proposed open pit mine at the McNab Creek estuary.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1871	459 - 2	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Review of the Environmental Impact Statement for Burnco Aggregate Project: threats to fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek watershed.</p> <p>Stamford Environmental Mike Stamford, MSc. For Sunshine Coast Conservation Association 30 September 2016</p> <p>This letter provides comments on the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Golder Associates for Burnco Aggregates (cited as Burnco 2016), which describes the potential impacts and compensation plans for fish and fish habitat around proposed a gravel mining operation in the McNab Creek watershed.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1872	459 - 3	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Four value components (VC's) have been chosen by the proponent to evaluate impacts from mining gravel in the McNab Creek flood plain. These include: cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki</i>; anadromous and freshwater forms), chum salmon (<i>O. keta</i>), pink salmon (<i>O. gorbuscha</i>), and coho salmon (<i>O. kisutch</i>). Baseline sampling (Golder 2016) examined the distribution of summer rearing juvenile fish spanning three years (2009, 2010, 2011), and overwintering juveniles during one year (2012), all in the local study area (LSA). Juvenile densities appear to have been evaluated during only one summer rearing season (i.e. a sample size of one during 2010). Adult abundance estimates (termed escapement) were collected using foot surveys of McNab Creek and WC2 (a constructed ground water channel) during late summer and early winter of years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. Each survey crew of two visually assessed species and numbers (counts) of migrating adult salmon from the stream banks.</p>	<p>The introduction to the Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat Baseline (Appendix 5.1-A of the EAC Application/EIS) provides a set of objectives for the habitat assessments and fish sampling that was conducted. This is summarized below:</p> <p>"The objectives of the habitat assessments were to collect information regarding the location and extent of available fish habitats and to assess the characteristics of these habitats. The objective of the fish sampling program was to collect information regarding the fish community present, and the distribution and habitat use of fish species potentially affected by the Proposed Project. This report provides a baseline description of the watercourses (both constructed and natural), habitat characteristics, habitat quality, fish distribution and fish use within the watercourses present near the Proposed Project."</p> <p>BURNCO agrees that attempting to collect representative density and abundance information for highly variable salmonid populations is not particularly useful. We recognize that anadromous salmonid populations are influenced by a wide range of density dependent and density independent factors in both freshwater and marine phases of their life history. That is why fish sampling was done to provide information regarding fish distribution, habitat utilization and relative abundance among the various watercourses within the LSA. A variety of methods including electrofishing, minnow trapping, visual observation and fyke netting were used to gather this information. Collecting data on fish species and age class provides useful information for the evaluation of potential Project related effects.</p> <p>Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will cover monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Proposed Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Proposed Project effects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1873	459 - 4	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>It remains unclear what these data will be used for. For instance, juvenile fish densities and even their distribution in nature often fluctuate enormously among years so knowing these parameters from a single year of sampling (i.e. 2010) have limited use. Similarly, understanding the distribution of rearing juveniles is limited since sampling appears to have been restricted to small enclosed areas, excluding long stretches of other rearing areas. These data do not provide sufficient resolution to evaluate threats to fish populations from any anthropogenic disturbances to their home stream (i.e. McNab Creek and associated groundwater fed channels). More appropriate data would include a temporal series of abundance estimates (e.g. densities collected over a minimum of five years prior to development) to provide base line population abundance estimates. Distribution data would better be examined with open site electrofishing spanning larger genera areas and include a wider range of habitat types. Focusing sampling effort in small areas appropriate for installing enclosure nets biases the sample, especially if the data are used to evaluate species presence in the watershed and identifying value components.</p>	<p>The introduction to the Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat Baseline (Appendix 5.1-A of the EAC Application/EIS) provides a set of objectives for the habitat assessments and fish sampling that was conducted. This is summarized below:</p> <p>"The objectives of the habitat assessments were to collect information regarding the location and extent of available fish habitats and to assess the characteristics of these habitats. The objective of the fish sampling program was to collect information regarding the fish community present, and the distribution and habitat use of fish species potentially affected by the Proposed Project. This report provides a baseline description of the watercourses (both constructed and natural), habitat characteristics, habitat quality, fish distribution and fish use within the watercourses present near the Proposed Project."</p> <p>BURNCO agrees that attempting to collect representative density and abundance information for highly variable salmonid populations is not particularly useful. We recognize that anadromous salmonid populations are influenced by a wide range of density dependent and density independent factors in both freshwater and marine phases of their life history. That is why fish sampling was done to provide information regarding fish distribution, habitat utilization and relative abundance among the various watercourses within the LSA. A variety of methods including electrofishing, minnow trapping, visual observation and fyke netting were used to gather this information. Collecting data on fish species and age class provides useful information for the evaluation of potential Project related effects.</p> <p>Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will cover monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Proposed Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Proposed Project effects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1874	459 - 5	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Perhaps more importantly, the fish data should also include adult abundance estimates to gain perspective on natural (pre impact escapement) population trends and distribution. The baseline data collected for this project provide a brief snap shot of migrating adult salmon visually observed from the stream bank during spawning surveys. Walking along the stream bank observing migrating fish have limited accuracy of counts (i.e. low capture probabilities) and even provides questionable species identifications. These data do not have sufficient resolution (e.g. no capture probabilities provided) to evaluate: a) changes in population productivity for any species that might result from anthropogenic disturbances in their watershed (e.g. gravel mining); b) changes in population productivity or distribution of any species resulting from actions designed to compensate for disturbances (e.g. WC2 extension). Without rigorous prior information that accurately estimates fish population abundance and distribution in McNab watershed how will these fish data be useful?</p>	<p>The introduction to the Fisheries and Freshwater Habitat Baseline (Appendix 5.1-A of the EAC Application/EIS) provides a set of objectives for the habitat assessments and fish sampling that was conducted. This is summarized below:</p> <p>"The objectives of the habitat assessments were to collect information regarding the location and extent of available fish habitats and to assess the characteristics of these habitats. The objective of the fish sampling program was to collect information regarding the fish community present, and the distribution and habitat use of fish species potentially affected by the Proposed Project. This report provides a baseline description of the watercourses (both constructed and natural), habitat characteristics, habitat quality, fish distribution and fish use within the watercourses present near the Proposed Project."</p> <p>BURNCO agrees that attempting to collect representative density and abundance information for highly variable salmonid populations is not particularly useful. We recognize that anadromous salmonid populations are influenced by a wide range of density dependent and density independent factors in both freshwater and marine phases of their life history. That is why fish sampling was done to provide information regarding fish distribution, habitat utilization and relative abundance among the various watercourses within the LSA. A variety of methods including electrofishing, minnow trapping, visual observation and fyke netting were used to gather this information. Collecting data on fish species and age class provides useful information for the evaluation of potential Project related effects.</p> <p>Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will cover monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Proposed Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Proposed Project effects.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1875	459 - 6	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>The environmental impact statement cites DFO and MOE data that suggest fewer than 500 adult salmon historically return to McNab Creek each year. How were these numbers determined? If these estimates of adult abundance are close to being accurate then these small populations are especially vulnerable to threats from disturbances in their home stream (including the estuary) and highlights the urgency for conservation assessments for these species. The Government of BC is currently working to assess the conservation status of our native species (e.g. Hagen and Decker 2011; Stamford et al. 2015) because the public values increasingly recognize the importance of conserving our living resources (i.e. the unique diversity of the native species in B.C.). Conservation assessments often identify areas where past behaviours during resource extraction have pushed fish populations into situations of high extinction risk or areas where extirpations have occurred in watersheds and these impacts are no longer acceptable in B.C. Resource extraction practices are increasingly required to be precautionary in their development plans to avoid causing unforeseen (miscalculated) impacts and threats to native species. For instance, with evidence suggesting small populations of salmon exist in McNab watershed should trigger a sampling regime designed to accurately identify all species present, evaluate their distribution and habitat use, population abundance. These data are needed to evaluate conservation status and identify behaviours that avoid threats to these populations. Instead, Burnco (2016) appears to suggest that evidence for small salmon populations should facilitate freedom for any industrial development behaviour. This</p>	<p>The numbers provided were obtained from federal and provincial fisheries databases.</p> <p>DFO. 2012. Mapster. Available at: <a href="http://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/gis-sig/maps-cartes-eng.htm">http://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/gis-sig/maps-cartes-eng.htm</a> Accessed January 2013</p> <p>MoE (BC Ministry of Environment). 2012. Habitat Wizard. Available at: <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/habwiz/">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/habwiz/</a>. Accessed January 2013</p> <p>These databases include the results of annual salmon escapement surveys that were historically conducted as far back as the 1940s. These escapement surveys used visual observation methods similar to the spawner surveys conducted more recently at the Proposed Project site. It is true that an annual surveys only provide a snapshot each year. A review of several decades of such information does indicate that the timing and size of the salmon runs in the McNab system are highly variable. That is why the assessment provided a range as well as an average return. Salmon returns to smaller coastal stream systems tend to be highly variable due to the wide variety of freshwater and marine factors that may influence their survival.</p> <p>Please see the response to the comment above regarding the objectives for fish sampling.</p> <p>The assessment did not intend to suggest that smaller populations warrant a less conservative approach. The assessment conclusions are based on the expectation that Proposed Project design and mitigation measures, including habitat offsetting for direct and indirect effects to fish habitat, are expected to avoid/reduce the potential for fish habitat quantity and quality to be affected.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1876	459 - 7	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Other salmonid species present in the watershed were excluded from the VC list due to “infrequent sightings or observations in the baseline sampling” (Golder Associates 2016). Steelhead/rainbow trout (<i>O. mykiss</i>) and chinook salmon (<i>O. tshawytschaw</i>) are both known to inhabit McNab watershed but baseline sampling has been insufficient to evaluate fish abundance, or even distribution.</p> <p>Low abundance in baseline sampling is the stated reason for their exclusion, yet capturing eight adult steelhead was mentioned briefly in the document. Also excluded from the VC list is the Dolly Varden (<i>Salvelinus malma</i>), which is present in the regional study area (e.g. adjacent watersheds and further upstream; Hatfield Consultants Ltd. 1997; Whelan and Associates Ltd. 1999). All of these species have both resident and anadromous life histories, which means they use McNab Creek and the estuary to complete their life history. The McNab Creek estuary is the second largest estuary (highly productive area) in Howe Sound and provides critical habitat for numerous species (including anadromous fish). McNab estuary probably provides critical rearing and overwintering habitat for populations derived from surrounding areas (e.g. those that spawn in adjacent streams); many small populations especially vulnerable to disturbances. Given the increasing conservation and economic values that biodiversity provides both to First Nations and British Columbians in general the disturbances to the estuary during 16 years of resource extraction should not be minimized.</p>	<p>Low numbers of steelhead and chinook were captured during a comprehensive fish sampling program that extended over a number of years and used a variety of fish sampling techniques including electrofishing, minnow trapping and fyke netting. These results suggest that steelhead and chinook are not abundant within the LSA. The assessment documents that five steelhead were captured during sampling.</p> <p>Species such as steelhead, chinook and Dolly Varden may not be common in the LSA and thus they were not identified as VCs. This does not mean that potential effects on them were ignored. Consideration of issues such as adequate stream flow and water quality for VC species also serves to protect these less common species.</p> <p>BURNCO agrees that disturbance to McNab Creek and the McNab Creek estuary should be avoided as much as is practical. Proposed Project design and mitigation measures presented in the EAC Application/EIS are expected to avoid/reduce potential Project related effects to fish and fish habitat in these areas.</p>
1877	459 - 8	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Burnco (2016) list numerous possible accidents but each is classified as negligible in their likelihood of occurrence. There is no way of evaluating these predictions or the cumulative effects that could cause a general erosion of habitat quality in this important ecosystem.</p>	<p>Potential effects associated with accidents and malfunctions were characterized as negligible based on the low likelihood of occurrence and the implementation of existing best management practices and standards that are regularly used and have a high degree of reliability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1878	459 - 9	Sunshine Coast Conservation Association	Sunshine Coast, BC	The gravel mining operation in McNab watershed will remove vast quantities of gravel that will permanently impact the watershed. Burnco (2016) has seriously downplayed the potential impacts on the surrounding ecology in Howe Sound. Yet any miscalculations in their perceived operations cannot be evaluated because prior biological data has not been collected. The potential cost to our living resources and recovering biodiversity that depends on McNab watershed and estuary are high and there are other local sources of gravel available. We urge the regulators of our public resources to consider the potential impacts on our living resources and not allow this development to occur. To permanently disfigure an estuary and potentially deplete biological functioning in one of the most productive areas in Howe Sound carry serious consequences to long-term economics and general well being to future generations of British Columbians.	The biological function of the estuary is influenced by the sediment supply currently entering the estuary from McNab Creek which is derived from actively eroding locations within the watershed. The extraction of terrestrial gravel deposits from the pit is not expected to impact or change the function of the estuary because the alluvial fan is not a contributor to the sediment/gravel budget.  Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will include consistent monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Project caused effects.
1879	460 - 1	John Adams	North Vancouver, BC	We all cherish and celebrate the recovery of Howe Sound after decades of toxic pollution from heavy industry. BC taxpayers paid millions to clean up the Britannia mine in Howe Sound and now finally those actions, along with other conservation efforts, are paying off with the return of fish stocks, dolphins, orcas, whales and a proliferation of bald eagles and other wildlife.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1880	460 - 2	John Adams	North Vancouver, BC	Please bring to an end the proposed Burnco open pit mine before massive economic harm is caused to thousands of local residents and businesses including our film and tourism industries as well as countless dollars have been spent by both BC and Federal regulators evaluating whether the environmental destruction of a portion of this sensitive ecosystem can be "mitigated".	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1881	460 - 3	John Adams	North Vancouver, BC	We support the creation of a long term comprehensive land and water use plan for economic and social activities in the region that are compatible with sustainable uses of the Howe Sound.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1882	460 - 4	John Adams	North Vancouver, BC	We ask you, as our elected officials, to stop this ill-advised project that will destroy a portion of this amazing natural resource, all for the sake of the short term profits of a mining company.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1883	461 - 1	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	My name is Sam Wainwright and I am the owner of Lot #30 on Gambier Island. This lot is directly across from the proposed Bunco Site. I have owned this site for over 10 years.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1884	461 - 2	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	I am completely against the development of the Burnco Mine Project and have been since it was first preposed. Over the past 10 years I have watched the growth and return of our natural wildlife come back into the region. This includes fish, birds, crabs, dolphins & whales! This area is treasure of the BC Coast line and needs to be treated as such.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1885	461 - 3	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	My family and 100's & thousands of others treat and respect these marine parks as the jewel and where they spend their most precious time with their family & friends to enjoy and admire its beauty.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
1886	461 - 4	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	To allow Bunco to roll out their mining project would be devastating to the area, it neighbours and most importantly the wild life! We can lot let this happen!	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1887	461 - 5	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	The BC government must lead the way and put a stop to project such as these. They must be part of leading the world towards a more beautiful, green environment where people, nature, and wildlife can all live together and enjoy its beauty. I Sam Wainwright of LOT #30 on Gambier Island which is located directly across from Burnco preposed site STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH ALLOWING THE BURNCO MINE TO OPERATE.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1888	462 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Langdale, BC	There cannot be any reason other than greed to disturb this beautiful, pristine coastal area and the ecosystem it supports.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1889	463 - 1	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The proposed gravel mine is completely incompatible with the recovery of Howe Sound from years of industrial pollution.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1890	463 - 2	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound is a great recreational and tourism resource on the doorstep of Vancouver. It is also the gateway to the Squamish-Whistler-Pemberton region which is of enormous importance to the tourism industry in British Columbia.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1891	463 - 3	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	It should be protected for its scenic beauty, recreational use and environmental values. The proposed gravel mine is a threat to all of these.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1892	463 - 4	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	I am deeply concerned about the impact of the mining operations on terrestrial wildlife in the MacNab Creek area, and the marine life at the mouth of MacNab Creek and in the wider Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1893	463 - 5	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	I am deeply concerned about the impact of the mining operations on terrestrial wildlife in the MacNab Creek area, and the marine life at the mouth of MacNab Creek and in the wider Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1894	463 - 6	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	I am deeply concerned about the impact of the mining operations on terrestrial wildlife in the MacNab Creek area, and the marine life at the mouth of MacNab Creek and in the wider Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1895	463 - 7	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The mining operations themselves will create light pollution, noise, sediment in the waters, destruction of the estuary, and will increase marine traffic in Howe Sound to an unacceptable level. There is likely to be a negative impact on commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as marine mammals which are now returning to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1896	463 - 8	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The mining operations themselves will create light pollution, noise, sediment in the waters, destruction of the estuary, and will increase marine traffic in Howe Sound to an unacceptable level. There is likely to be a negative impact on commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as marine mammals which are now returning to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
1897	463 - 9	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The mining operations themselves will create light pollution, noise, sediment in the waters, destruction of the estuary, and will increase marine traffic in Howe Sound to an unacceptable level. There is likely to be a negative impact on commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as marine mammals which are now returning to Howe Sound.	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1898	463 - 10	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The mining operations themselves will create light pollution, noise, sediment in the waters, destruction of the estuary, and will increase marine traffic in Howe Sound to an unacceptable level. There is likely to be a negative impact on commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as marine mammals which are now returning to Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1899	463 - 11	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	The mining operations themselves will create light pollution, noise, sediment in the waters, destruction of the estuary, and will increase marine traffic in Howe Sound to an unacceptable level. There is likely to be a negative impact on commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as marine mammals which are now returning to Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1900	463 - 12	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	There are many alternative sources of gravel and there is no justification proceeding with this project.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1901	463 - 13	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	There is minimal economic benefit to British Columbia, as a whole, and Howe Sound region, in particular.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
1902	463 - 14	Peter Williamson	Bowen Island, BC	I implore you not to allow this project to proceed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1903	464 - 1	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Burnco proposes environmental degradation to a huge riparian area. Modification of the riparian zone including bank erosion, direct destruction from heavy equipment operation, discharges from equipment and refueling, reduction in groundwater elevations, impacts on structures and access, disturbance to flora and fauna and all life forms, impacts on coastal processes.</p> <p>The area encompasses many smaller streams which provide necessary nutrients to fish in the estuary. This project will wipe out a major feed source, which would harm or disturb lifeforms in the estuary. Increased sediment loads from the proposed new channels will be flowing to the estuary causing detrimental effect on marine lifeforms.</p> <p>To disturb the McNab Creek riparian area would be extremely harmful to all life forms in the estuary including fish in the Sound. This project will do more harm than good.</p> <p>As stated at Provincial site <a href="http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources">http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources</a> "A riparian zone, or riparian area, is the interface between land and a river or stream. Although riparian areas make up only a small fraction of the land, they are among the most productive and valuable of all landscape types".</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1904	464 - 2	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Burnco proposes environmental degradation to a huge riparian area. Modification of the riparian zone including bank erosion, direct destruction from heavy equipment operation, discharges from equipment and refueling, reduction in groundwater elevations, impacts on structures and access, disturbance to flora and fauna and all life forms, impacts on coastal processes.</p> <p>The area encompasses many smaller streams which provide necessary nutrients to fish in the estuary. This project will wipe out a major feed source, which would harm or disturb lifeforms in the estuary. Increased sediment loads from the proposed new channels will be flowing to the estuary causing detrimental effect on marine lifeforms.</p> <p>To disturb the McNab Creek riparian area would be extremely harmful to all life forms in the estuary including fish in the Sound. This project will do more harm than good.</p> <p>As stated at Provincial site <a href="http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources">http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources</a> "A riparian zone, or riparian area, is the interface between land and a river or stream. Although riparian areas make up only a small fraction of the land, they are among the most productive and valuable of all landscape types".</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1905	464 - 3	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Burnco proposes environmental degradation to a huge riparian area. Modification of the riparian zone including bank erosion, direct destruction from heavy equipment operation, discharges from equipment and refueling, reduction in groundwater elevations, impacts on structures and access, disturbance to flora and fauna and all life forms, impacts on coastal processes.</p> <p>The area encompasses many smaller streams which provide necessary nutrients to fish in the estuary. This project will wipe out a major feed source, which would harm or disturb lifeforms in the estuary. Increased sediment loads from the proposed new channels will be flowing to the estuary causing detrimental effect on marine lifeforms.</p> <p>To disturb the McNab Creek riparian area would be extremely harmful to all life forms in the estuary including fish in the Sound. This project will do more harm than good.</p> <p>As stated at Provincial site <a href="http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources">http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources</a> "A riparian zone, or riparian area, is the interface between land and a river or stream. Although riparian areas make up only a small fraction of the land, they are among the most productive and valuable of all landscape types".</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
1906	465 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>The Howe Sound is an incredibly sensitive environment. We have already made this mistake once in the past with the old Britannia Mine, and waste materials from the mine which were not properly dealt with leaked into the ocean and caused environmental devastation for years. It has only been recently that we have seen changes in the Howe Sound that mark it returning to a healthy state- whales such as orcas and dolphins are becoming more plentiful and venturing further in like they used too before the first mine. The reason we teach history in our schools is not only to give children perspective to the world around them, but to discourage the mistakes we made in the past. Please let the failures of the past warn and guide your actions of the future.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1907	466 - 1	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>It would be appreciated,if someone would kindly produce for the public, the missing information in this correspondence listed under 'McNab Piping Risk'</p> <p>at <a href="http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/html/deploy/epic_document_355_40820.html">http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/html/deploy/epic_document_355_40820.html</a></p> <p>DATE June 13, 2014 REFERENCE No. 091-416-0004/4000 TO Don Chorley CC Alan Calder FROM Willy Zawadzki, Richard Butler EMAIL rbutler@golder.com GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT RISK OF PIPING DUE TO CHANGES IN GROUNDWATER SEEPAGE GRADIENTS PROPOSED GRAVEL PIT, MCNAB CREEK</p> <p>2.0 CRITICAL GRADIENT AND POTENTIAL RISK OF PIPING The results of numerous gradation analyses of the natural soils at the proposed gravel pit are presented in the Concrete Aggregate Assessment report 09-1416004/4000 dated April 13, 2012 and a typical plot of these ???</p>	<p>BURNCO acknowledges that second page of the letter was partially truncated in the version posted online. A corrected version of Appendix 5.6-E was provided to the Technical Working Group and to the BCEAO / CEA Agency for posting on 20-Oct-2016.</p>
1908	467 - 1	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Similar to letters sent to the BCEAO a few years ago, we will continue to question the need for another large scale industrial mine within one of the magical areas of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1909	467 - 2	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>This is a place where silence and beauty is so spectacular that you can read a book while hearing only the occasional splash of a seal, the flapping of wings from a blue heron, and the crunching teeth of a sea otter while eating his morning fish. Mountains tower straight out of the ocean 3,000 - 5,000 feet in a 360 degree view. Kids paddle board in notoriously calm waters. There is recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife. You may think you are in Alaska but you are only 45 minutes from downtown Vancouver.</p> <p>It seems so long ago that the Howe Sound was so polluted that no one was even interested in enjoying the many wonders of this area. This is not the only area that has had a eye opener. Consider, the dump within the Whistler town center 40 years ago before it was really discovered. The logging dumps in Tofino and clear cutting in Clayoquot Sound, prior to it becoming a UNESCO biosphere or the recent success of the Sea to Sky Gondola in a town that has emerged from a rough industrial history. Even the shores of Vancouver were once filled with heavy industry and is now one of the most livable metropolitan areas in Canada. The beauty of McNab Valley is that it is not overcome by tourists, it is actually slightly hard to get to without a boat. However, there are many areas in BC (such as the ones above) that were also once hard to get to. Access to Howe Sounds is slowly changing with the growth in water taxi's more and more personal water craft, kayaks and paddle boards etc. Please be cognizant of the monetary value in increased marine resources and potential tourism dollars that will greatly</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1910	467 - 3	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The immense benefits that this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems is truly spectacular. The industrial applications that are being considered for this region are truly disappointing. I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1911	467 - 4	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	The immense benefits that this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems is truly spectacular. The industrial applications that are being considered for this region are truly disappointing. I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1912	467 - 5	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>More Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place and no repercussions should the noise be disturbing.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1913	467 - 6	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>More Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place and no repercussions should the noise be disturbing.</li> </ul>	<p>Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1914	467 - 7	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the effects on marine life, wildlife, fish etc. be negative (which is very likely) there are no repercussions or any way of turning this project around once it has been approved.</li> </ul>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
1915	467 - 8	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco and Golder have a huge amount irrelevant references and personal communications cited within the EAC Application/EIS. They are clearly trying to overwhelm the concerned parties with information that no one has time to actually qualify.</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
1916	467 - 9	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1917	467 - 10	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1918	467 - 11	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco is pushing hard to influence Sunshine Coast regional District to rezoning the property from current rural to industrial use. We don't need more industry in Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1919	467 - 12	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No benefit to the local community and no appreciation for Howe Sound unique biosphere and beauty, only loss of a spectacular valley just 30 minutes from Horseshoe Bay.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
1920	467 - 13	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been and would continue to be a decline in property values and natural capital values within the region.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1921	467 - 14	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be many long term effects of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine (and only 12 permanent jobs created for Burnco).</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1922	467 - 15	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley has not been accounted for.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1923	467 - 16	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once approved it is very likely that they will apply for enhanced future expansion plans of the mine beyond 16 years (could double) and its current size (could double).</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
1924	467 - 17	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BURNCO has donated more than \$200,000 to Liberals and NDP in BC</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1925	467 - 18	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>I know that I am not alone with these concerns. There are many professional groups that all agree that a mine of this nature is a bad idea. Below is a snapshot of who else is opposed to this new industrialization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Suzuki Foundation</li> <li>• Environmental consulting firms</li> <li>• GeoTech firms</li> <li>• Marine biologists</li> <li>• BC Stream Keepers</li> <li>• Squamish First Nations</li> <li>• Tourism operators</li> <li>• Yacht Clubs and out-stations</li> <li>• Local municipalities and residents</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries</li> <li>• Local kids camps</li> <li>• Local recreation seekers</li> <li>• Local property owners</li> <li>• International tourists</li> </ul> <p>The ecological value of this area is so unique that there have also been applications and proposals for large parts of the Howe Sounds to be designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere...or, ironically more industrial land!?</p> <p>I plead with you to think about the future of the Howe Sound and save it from becoming more industrialized.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1926	467 - 19	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The ecological value of this area is so unique that there have also been applications and proposals for large parts of the Howe Sounds to be designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere...or, ironically more industrial land!? I plead with you to think about the future of the Howe Sound and save it from becoming more industrialized. Thank you your time to consider.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1927	468 - 1	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	I attended the Burnco Public Open House in West Vancouver and commend Burnco for the effort put into the materials and information and presentation. I am however, opposed to industrialization that impacts the foreshore and water resources of Howe Sound. I have been travelling Howe Sound by boat and water taxi for 24 years and have seen first hand the issues with development that impacts watersheds and streams and the very lengthy period of recovery time needed when these resources are impacted. I have also seen first hand what many other commenters have noted, an apparent but slow recovery of Howe Sound and the return of sea life that is notable and significant - whales and dolphins on a regular basis and primarily just the last 2-3 years.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1928	468 - 2	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	In my area, we have a salmon spawning creek that sees wildly varying returns of salmon annually. Howe Sound supports salmon and we need to be conscientious about how we manage the area.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
1929	468 - 3	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	While Burnco's plans for fish habitat between the future mine lake and the ocean seem adequate at first look, the protection of this habitat from mine lake overflow appears to depend on a dam gate and Golder consultants were unable to answer who would monitor and control this once the project was closed down. I suspect it would be the local government and paid for by us, the tax payers. This needs to be a factor that is determined up front. Too often we see the taxpayer on the hook after private industry has finished a project. The examples are numerous.	A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.  Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1930	468 - 4	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	This area of Howe Sound is also subject extreme winter rains and heavy storms. Given this, I question whether the mine lake can be contained in such a way as to have no impact on McNab Creek.	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
1931	468 - 5	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	The watersheds and major freshwater sources into Howe Sound have had enough industrialization what with Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, Woodfibre (now closed but under consideration for another major industrial project), water log booming (now discontinued but having long term impacts on ocean floor health), commercial activity at Squamish, and the severe problems caused by Britannia Mine that have cost taxpayers millions in cleanup.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1932	468 - 6	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	Obviously aggregate is needed for the lower mainland however Howe Sound watersheds are not an appropriate source. Howe Sound has much more economic and social value by being able to support and improve marine life and stocks and as a world class recreational area within minutes of the city of Vancouver,	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
1933	468 - 7	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	Obviously aggregate is needed for the lower mainland however Howe Sound watersheds are not an appropriate source. Howe Sound has much more economic and social value by being able to support and improve marine life and stocks and as a world class recreational area within minutes of the city of Vancouver,	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1934	468 - 8	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	Obviously aggregate is needed for the lower mainland however Howe Sound watersheds are not an appropriate source. Howe Sound has much more economic and social value by being able to support and improve marine life and stocks and as a world class recreational area within minutes of the city of Vancouver,	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1935	468 - 9	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	If for some reason, the government approves this project, I hope my concerns about the mine lake are closely and thoroughly examined and a future management plan is in place that will not land in the taxpayers lap.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
1936	468 - 10	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	I also believe that if it is approved, it should only be permitted as a seasonal operation, that excludes the summer months and additionally should only operate at any time from Monday to Friday limited to 8 hours a day.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1937	468 - 11	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	The noise concerns mentioned by other commenters are very important and this application should not take precedence over, or compromise, existing users and landowners and campers (Camp Latona children's camp) and the enjoyment of their facilities and properties. I do want to reiterate however, that overall, I do not support further industrialization of Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1938	468 - 12	Michele Hall-McCaffrey	Gambier Island, BC	I was driving through Princeton recently, an easy drive from Vancouver, and they are building mountains out of mining waste aggregate. Perhaps the focus should be on lowering the cost of transporting this to the lower mainland.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1939	469 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>I am concerned with the approval process for this project for two reasons.</p> <p>1. The proponent delivers all the evidence. However there is a wealth of educated and intelligent information material in the public domain that disputes many of the findings presented by the proponent. The proponent's representation of what will be destroyed and what will be remedied is in stark contrast to the public domain materials.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1940	469 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Only a truly independent review - paid by the proponent but carried out by government appointed and independent experts - can truly determine impact, cost and benefit of the proposed wet mine.	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1941	469 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Only a truly independent review - paid by the proponent but carried out by government appointed and independent experts - can truly determine impact, cost and benefit of the proposed wet mine.	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare an environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>
1942	469 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	2. A wet gravel mine is unusual for aggregate mining in British Columbia. It is a highly disruptive process and will negatively impact water quality, flora and fauna considerably.	<p>Wet mining is the selected mining method because of the proximity of the aggregate deposit relative to the existing water table. Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1943	469 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	2. A wet gravel mine is unusual for aggregate mining in British Columbia. It is a highly disruptive process and will negatively impact water quality, flora and fauna considerably.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1944	469 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	2. A wet gravel mine is unusual for aggregate mining in British Columbia. It is a highly disruptive process and will negatively impact water quality, flora and fauna considerably.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1945	469 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Burnco is an American company with little knowledge or interest in the sensitive environment of Howe Sound in general and the MacNabe Creek in particular.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1946	469 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	It is also understood that the low-cost wet mining process proposed will put the BC based aggregate producers under competitive pressure. It appears that the local sector will be put at a disadvantage. The questions then remain: Will there even be an economic net-benefit - ever - during the duration of the project; and if yes whose benefit will it be?	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1947	469 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	It is also understood that the low-cost wet mining process proposed will put the BC based aggregate producers under competitive pressure. It appears that the local sector will be put at a disadvantage. The questions then remain: Will there even be an economic net-benefit - ever - during the duration of the project; and if yes whose benefit will it be?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1948	470 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Why is it that after years of comments that we still are at this stage. This Burnco open pit mine doesn't belong in the Howe Sound. It has taken decades to get this area cleaned up for all of us in the Howe Sound using tax payer's funds.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
1949	470 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	The many replies that get send to the EAO asking to not have this developed. I wonder if anyone even reads these as there hasn't been a single project that hasn't been approved.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
1950	470 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	This gravel mine benefits only Burnco and maybe 10 employees once finished.	Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Benefits of the Proposed Project include: - capital expenditures (\$21.5 million), - operational expenditures (\$13 million/year), - direct, indirect and induced employment, and - taxation revenue.  Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.  BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.  Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are: - Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses; - Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel; - New amphibian breeding habitat ; - Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1951	470 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Tourism last year created more income to BC than any other industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1952	470 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	Let's think about what we are doing long term. No No No Burnco in the Howe Sound.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
1953	471 - 1	Linda Ruiz	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound has recently undergone restoration from many years of industry. It is just coming back.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1954	471 - 2	Linda Ruiz	Gibsons, BC	This area is more valuable to tourism and fisheries than this proposed mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1955	471 - 3	Linda Ruiz	Gibsons, BC	This area is more valuable to tourism and fisheries than this proposed mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1956	471 - 4	Linda Ruiz	Gibsons, BC	This is not the place for a mine. There are too many irreparable hazards to the surrounding marine environment.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1957	471 - 5	Linda Ruiz	Gibsons, BC	This is not the place for a mine. There are too many irreparable hazards to the surrounding marine environment.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
1958	472 - 1	Brian Gaffney	North Vancouver, BC	Stop the proposed gravel mine in Howe Sound	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1959	473 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	Howe Sound is a beautiful place where people from around the world admire while travelling to Whistler or touring BC. A place of spectacular beauty and life. It needs to be protected.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
1960	473 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	What if the city fathers so long ago decided to sell the now world famous Stanley Park to industry citing the need to keep the economy healthy? We would not have a world class city with the jewel of Stanley Park in it's crown. It would be just another waterfront city, not a spectacular place where the people are proud of their inheritance, a gift from the wise city fathers Please do not destroy Howe Sound with another scar on the landscape.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1961	473 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	Please do not destroy Howe Sound with another scar on the landscape.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1962	473 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Garibaldi Highlands, BC	The Liberal legacy is already greatly tarnished. Don't make it worse.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1963	474 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Please do NOT approve the aggregate project at the McNab Creek location. If such a mine is deemed necessary, please make sure it is sited in a less sensitive area. Too much GOOD environmental remedial WORK has been done in the Howe Sound area to allow for something that will almost certainly reverse previous damage. Thank you.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1964	475 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I believe the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project should not be allowed to proceed based on a long list of items. They include the following:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1965	475 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health</p> <p>Noise - The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis, will create Noise health effects. Health consequences of regular exposure, to consistent elevated sound levels, from the new noise generated by this facility, is known to cause hearing impairment, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, annoyance, and sleep disturbance.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
1966	475 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Air Quality including dust - Dust and particulate matter generated from the crushing facility and mining operation will impact the health of residents of the Howe Sound region. These harmful allergens can trigger allergic reactions and asthma in many people.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1967	475 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Economy</p> <p>Howe Sound directly contributes hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue from tourism, entertainment and commercial fishing industries. The Burnco Aggregate Mine Project will reduce this revenue significantly and not provide corresponding off setting revenue for the losses incurred.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1968	475 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis will lower the property value of homes located in the area including Lions Bay, Furry Creek, the proposed Porteau Cove housing development, Gambier Island, Anvil Island, Britania Mines and of course McNab Creek.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1969	475 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Dust and particulate matter generated by the crushing facility and mining operation will increase health costs to BC Taxpayers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1970	475 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The Wave wakes from commercial barge traffic will create damage to properties along the shore as well as crown beaches/streams/shore lines which will increase insurance claims and premiums in BC.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
1971	475 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Environment Ground water pollution from the mine will have a negative environmental impact on the region and in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 (Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1972	475 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The mine will create risks to Wildlife Safety including impacting of rare birds and protected species and disturbance of terrestrial vegetation unique to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1973	475 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Marine resources such as killer whales, dolphins, crabs, and trout will all be negatively impacted from the noise and disturbance of the estuary.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1974	475 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Burnco's consultants documenting that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk, re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
1975	475 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Social</p> <p>The McNab creek region is a known as a tourism and recreation area. Introducing a mining operation will severely impact and change the use of the region. The mine will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- limit the recreational activities enjoyed on the water in front of the estuary</li> <li>- limit if not stop the fishing and crabbing opportunities on the water in front of the area</li> <li>- severely impact the recreational opportunities on Gambier Island directly across from the area</li> <li>- new commercial barge traffic will create a hazardous situation for boaters, recreational kayakers and children on the water from the surrounding commercial kids camps</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1976	475 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1977	475 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Cultural</p> <p>There are several instances where historical first nations artifacts have been found in the region. Disturbing the estuary will limit, if not remove opportunities for archeological study.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Project to heritage resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 8.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>While archaeological field studies have been completed and no archaeological sites were recorded within the local study area (LSA), the area does retain potential to contain buried archaeological materials. If heritage resources are encountered, adverse effects mitigation would be facilitated through the implementation of a Heritage Resource Chance Find Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E - Section 16.0) to determine appropriate actions which would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- modify or stop any land-altering activities in the immediate vicinity;</li> <li>- notify the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation; and</li> <li>- determine an acceptable management strategy in consultation with the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation.</li> </ul>
1978	475 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1979	475 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
1980	475 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1981	475 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Other Heavy Industry Projects</p> <p>The Howe Sound region this is not an industrial area as Bunco describes. Previous or incumbent rights should not have precedent. Currently there are a large number of heavy industry based projects that are applying for approval in the Howe Sound area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Run of River at McNab Creek</li> <li>- LNG at the former Woodfibre Site</li> <li>- Garbage Incineration beside the Port Mellon Sawmill Squamish Port Expansion</li> <li>- A Pipeline in the Squamish Watershed to bring gas for the LNG plant</li> <li>- A possible bridge to the Sun Shine Coast from either Porteau Cove</li> </ul> <p>The Burnco project decision should take all projects listed into consideration when reviewing this application.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1982	475 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>A Telling Tale</p> <p>Sometimes speaking with the applicant and their consultants reveals the type of neighbour the applicant will be. The following quotes were received at the Burnco Open House held in Horsehoe Bay, in September 2016, from Burnco and Burnco representatives:</p> <p>"It's my land and I'll do what I want with it." from Mr Burns, CEO of Burnco when he interrupted a private conversation about how the Burnco proposed gravel mine appears to be taking up the whole McNab Creek foreshore and encroaching on McNab Creek.</p> <p>"Royalties from the project will be paid to another Burnco company" from Mr Burns, CEO of Bunco when asked about the revenue BC taxpayers should expect to receive from the Bunco proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek.</p> <p>"I've never been to the Burnco proposed gravel mine site" Environmental consultant who was responsible for the Sound assessment and mitigation plan.</p> <p>We ask you, Is this the type of company BC Taxpayers, the BC Government, Governments surrounding Howe Sound, First Nations and Sea to Sky residents/property owners want to be doing business with?</p>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1983	476 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>How can Burnco remove 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel from the McNab River estuary and not damage the ecosystem?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1984	476 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	In my opinion, there is no way to remediate.	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
1985	476 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	This project will damage the salmon spawning channel and will leave a big mess behind.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1986	476 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	This is a relatively small gravel deposit and Burnco has other sources to mine.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1987	476 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Also, with rising sea levels, I question how long the berm between the gravel mine and the foreshore will last.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential effects of future sea-level rise are addressed in Section 5.8.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted RSP2100 (sea-level height by 2100 relative to 2007 levels) using the mean sea-level rise was 18 cm, with a possible range of 6 to 30 cm. The predicted RSL2100 using the high predicted sea-level rise was 88 cm, with a possible range of 57 to 118 cm.</p> <p>Since the Proposed Project is expected to be completed by 2035 it is expected that rising sea levels of this amount will have little direct impact on the Proposed Project operation phase. The Proposed Project closure plan consists of removing surface infrastructure and site reclamation including a ground and surface water-fed lake (the pit lake), and therefore it is expected that the predicted rising sea level will have little impact on Proposed Project closure. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
1988	476 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	The value of this river estuary is in the salmon habitat it provides. Howe Sound is finally recovering after years of industrial activity. We are seeing the herring, salmon, dolphins and Orcas return.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1989	476 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	This gravel mine is a regressive step backwards. I'm strongly opposed to this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1990	477 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Approval of the Burnco proposal to place a gravel mine in the estuary at McNab Creek is a very bad idea for the marine environment, the residents in the area and the growing tourism industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1991	477 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Approval of the Burnco proposal to place a gravel mine in the estuary at McNab Creek is a very bad idea for the marine environment, the residents in the area and the growing tourism industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1992	477 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Approval of the Burnco proposal to place a gravel mine in the estuary at McNab Creek is a very bad idea for the marine environment, the residents in the area and the growing tourism industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
1993	478 - 1	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	As an avid outdoorsman I am opposed to the Burnco Project for the reasons listed below.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
1994	478 - 2	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	The impact of a an open pit gravel mine in the proposed location far exceeds the economic benefit of a private corporation	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1995	478 - 3	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver’s ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see “SuperNatural, British Columbia”, how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
1996	478 - 4	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
1997	478 - 5	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
1998	478 - 6	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
1999	478 - 7	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2000	478 - 8	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2001	478 - 9	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2002	478 - 10	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2003	478 - 11	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2004	478 - 12	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2005	478 - 13	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2006	478 - 14	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2007	478 - 15	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2008	478 - 16	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2009	478 - 17	Mark Robichaud	Squamish, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2010	479 - 1	Dave Hess	West Vancouver, BC	Please do not approve the application for the Burnco Aggregate Project proposed for the Howe Sound estuary of McNab Creek. Mining gravel in McNab Creek would destroy the estuary and natural beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2011	479 - 2	Dave Hess	West Vancouver, BC	This project would have devastating effects on fish habitat in the McNab estuary, as well as putting tonnes of effluent into the Howe Sound ocean currents.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2012	479 - 3	Dave Hess	West Vancouver, BC	Mining activity would also cause disruption or destruction of the successful elk repatriation project being carried out in the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2013	479 - 4	Dave Hess	West Vancouver, BC	Environmental degradation should not be allowed for the benefit of mining gravel from the McNab Creek estuary. Further destruction of wildlife habitat and the environment of Howe Sound is unacceptable. Please protect our natural wildlife and resources.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2014	479 - 5	Dave Hess	West Vancouver, BC	Please do NOT approve the Burnco Aggregate Project, either now or in the future. Thank you for considering these comments.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2015	480 - 1	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Pure and simple. This is a proposal that will have a negative environmental impact on Howe Sound.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2016	480 - 2	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound has the potential for a world class marine conservation area that would produce lots of tourist-related income for a multitude of local companies and a beautiful educational resource for millions, so close to a world class city.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2017	480 - 3	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound has the potential for a world class marine conservation area that would produce lots of tourist-related income for a multitude of local companies and a beautiful educational resource for millions, so close to a world class city.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2018	480 - 4	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	Why waste this wonderful place on a gravel pit?	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2019	480 - 5	Dr. Hugh Freeman	Bowen Island, BC	It is time for the BC and federal governments to become serious about preserving this wonderful place. It makes no sense.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
2020	481 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound needs to stay beautiful.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2021	481 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	This is where we live, play, and rely on the TOURISM for the economy. I say no to this project.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2022	482 - 1	Pamela Fitzpatrick	Vancouver, BC	Please think of the big picture involved in this proposed mine decision.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2023	482 - 2	Pamela Fitzpatrick	Vancouver, BC	Now that Howe Sound is finally recovering from the toxic pollution caused by decades of heavy industry, it is time for a comprehensive plan for the area: one which respects and honours the major and sensitive ecosystems now coming back to life, as well as the needs of residents and tourists. Not just the mining wants.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2024	482 - 3	Pamela Fitzpatrick	Vancouver, BC	Please do not allow this project to proceed; you will destroy an amazing natural resource.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2025	483 - 1	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Please post the attached file as the submission from My Sea to Sky. We are an organization of thousands of local citizens dedicated to the protection of Howe Sound for this and future generations of British Columbians. We see no benefit to local communities in the Burnco application. Rather, this project will significantly damage the local environment, degrade the tourism and recreational economy of Howe Sound, and destroy irreplaceable salmon habitat restored at public expense in the wake of a past era of careless destruction. We are firmly opposed to granting this application</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2026	483 - 2	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2027	483 - 3	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2028	483 - 4	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2029	483 - 5	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2030	483 - 6	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
2031	483 - 7	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCR D said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2032	483 - 8	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2033	483 - 9	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2034	483 - 10	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2035	483 - 11	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2036	483 - 12	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2037	483 - 13	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2038	483 - 14	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2039	483 - 15	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2040	483 - 16	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2041	483 - 17	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2042	483 - 18	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2043	483 - 19	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2044	483 - 20	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR D noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2045	483 - 21	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
2046	483 - 22	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2047	483 - 23	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2048	483 - 24	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
2049	483 - 25	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2050	483 - 26	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2051	483 - 27	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2052	483 - 28	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
2053	483 - 29	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2054	483 - 30	My Sea to Sky	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2055	484 - 1	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	I believe the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project should not be allowed to proceed based on a long list of items. They include the following:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2056	484 - 2	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health</p> <p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2057	484 - 3	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health</p> <p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2058	484 - 4	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2059	484 - 5	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2060	484 - 6	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Noise - The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application. The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis, will create Noise health effects. Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Health consequences of regular exposure, to consistent elevated sound levels, from the new noise generated by this facility, is known to cause hearing impairment, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, annoyance, and sleep disturbance.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2061	484 - 7	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Air Quality including dust - Dust and particulate matter generated from the crushing facility and mining operation will impact the health of residents of the Howe Sound region. These harmful allergens can trigger allergic reactions and asthma in many people. Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2062	484 - 8	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs. Siltation monitoring should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>
2063	484 - 9	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs. Siltation monitoring should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2064	484 - 10	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs. Siltation monitoring should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.	A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include: - Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations. - During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope. - The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.
2065	484 - 11	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Economy Howe Sound directly contributes hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue from tourism, entertainment and commercial fishing industries. The Burnco Aggregate Mine Project will reduce this revenue significantly and not provide corresponding off setting revenue for the losses incurred.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2066	484 - 12	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2067	484 - 13	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis will lower the property value of homes located in the area including Lions Bay, Furry Creek, the proposed Porteau Cove housing development, Gambier Island, Anvil Island, Britannia Mines and of course McNab Creek.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2068	484 - 14	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Dust and particulate matter generated by the crushing facility and mining operation will increase health costs to BC Taxpayers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2069	484 - 15	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Wakes from commercial barge traffic will increase insurance claims and Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2070	484 - 16	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA and the analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model. BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered. If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2071	484 - 17	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA and the analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model. BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered. If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.	The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.
2072	484 - 18	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Environment Ground water pollution from the mine will have a negative environmental impact on the region and in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2073	484 - 19	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The mine will create risks to Wildlife Safety including impacting of rare birds and protected species and disturbance of terrestrial vegetation unique to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2074	484 - 20	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Loss of productive salmon habitat, that will be impacted negatively from mining a pristine estuary. The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2075	484 - 21	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Loss of productive salmon habitat, that will be impacted negatively from mining a pristine estuary. The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2076	484 - 22	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Marine resources such as killer whales, dolphins, crabs, and trout will all be negatively impacted from the noise and disturbance of the estuary.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2077	484 - 23	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Burnco's consultants documenting that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk, re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2078	484 - 24	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Social</p> <p>The McNab creek region is a known as a tourism and recreation area. Introducing a mining operation will severely impact and change the use of the region. The mine will:</p> <p>limit the recreational activities enjoyed on the water in front of the estuary limit if not stop the fishing and crabbing opportunities on the water in front of the area severely impact the recreational opportunities on Gambier Island directly across from the area the increase commercial barge traffic will create a hazardous situation for boaters, recreational kayakers and children on the water from the surrounding commercial kids camps.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2079	484 - 25	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2080	484 - 26	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2081	484 - 27	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2082	484 - 28	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2083	484 - 29	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Cultural</p> <p>There are several instances where historical first nations artifacts have been found in the region. Disturbing the estuary will limit, if not remove opportunities for archeological study.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Project to heritage resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 8.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>While archaeological field studies have been completed and no archaeological sites were recorded within the local study area (LSA), the area does retain potential to contain buried archaeological materials. If heritage resources are encountered, adverse effects mitigation would be facilitated through the implementation of a Heritage Resource Chance Find Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E - Section 16.0) to determine appropriate actions which would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- modify or stop any land-altering activities in the immediate vicinity;</li> <li>- notify the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation; and</li> <li>- determine an acceptable management strategy in consultation with the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation.</li> </ul>
2084	484 - 30	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2085	484 - 31	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2086	484 - 32	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2087	484 - 33	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Other Heavy Industry Projects</p> <p>The Howe Sound region this is not an industrial area as Bunco describes. Previous or incumbent rights should not have precedent. Currently there are a large number of heavy industry based projects that are applying for approval in the Howe Sound area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Run of River at McNab Creek</li> <li>LNG at the former Woodfibre Site</li> <li>Garbage Incineration beside the Port Mellon Sawmill Squamish Port Expansion A Pipeline in the Squamish Watershed to bring gas for the LNG plant</li> <li>A possible bridge to the Sun Shine Coast from either Porteau Cove</li> </ul> <p>The Burnco project decision should take all projects listed into consideration when reviewing this application.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2088	484 - 34	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>A Telling Tale Sometimes speaking with the applicant and their consultants reveals the type of neighbour the applicant will be. The following quotes were received at the Burnco Open House held in Horsehoe Bay, in September 2016, from Burnco and Burnco representatives:</p> <p>"It's my land and I'll do what I want with it." from Mr Burns, CEO of Burnco when he interrupted a private conversation about how the Burnco proposed gravel mine appears to be taking up the whole McNab Creek foreshore and encroaching on McNab Creek.</p> <p>"Royalties from the project will be paid to another Burnco company" from Mr Burns, CEO of Bunco when asked about the revenue BC taxpayers should expect to receive from the Bunco proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek.</p> <p>"I've never been to the Burnco proposed gravel mine site" Environmental consultant who was responsible for the Sound assessment and mitigation plan.</p> <p>We ask you, Is this the type of company BC Taxpayers, the BC Government, Governments surrounding Howe Sound, First Nations and Sea to Sky residents/property owners want to be doing business with?</p>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2089	485 - 1	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	I am opposed to the Burnco Gravel Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2090	485 - 2	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	Environmentally this project would be a disaster for one of the 3 only Estuaries in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2091	485 - 3	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>This project has been refused in the past due to concerns about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, in particular the Chum and Coho Salmon.</p> <p>It's only because of gutted environmental laws by the Harper Government that Bunco is back trying to get approval. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to 'strong arm' the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as "the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat".</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2092	485 - 4	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2093	485 - 5	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>The concerns for Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
2094	485 - 6	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>b) DFO is very worried about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, particularly chum and coho salmon. The Vancouver Aquarium is concerned re the salmon, and re rockfish at the estuary mouth.</p> <p>c) The planned artificial salmon spawning channel would do nothing to compensate for the damage to fish and fish habitat in the McNab estuary.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2095	485 - 7	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>3. The effects of wet mining (digging the gravel out of water, where the estuary forest used to be):</p> <p>Burnco's argument that there won't be dust because they're mining "wet" is also misleading because the dust just becomes silt. The silt will kill the plant and animal life in the estuary.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2096	485 - 8	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2097	485 - 9	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2098	485 - 10	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2099	485 - 11	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
2100	485 - 12	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2101	485 - 13	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	5. Would require SLRD to rezone this land, moving this land into industrial zoning forever.	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2102	485 - 14	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that their is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employee people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2103	485 - 15	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that their is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employee people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2104	485 - 16	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>Economically: Burnco has not proven that there is a huge demand that cannot be met by existing quarries. In fact, my concern is that they are taking away work from BC Corporations and only looking to gain a foot into Howe Sound for the potential of bidding on work for Woodfibre LNG that would compete with existing businesses that employ people. Burnco's 12 full time jobs aren't worth it as they are not adding to the pool of jobs but just taking away existing jobs. So that nets zero employment benefit.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result in a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted area in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2105	485 - 17	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	<p>For those that reside in the area, 17 local residents, and 30 recreational properties, they stand to lose a quality of life they have enjoyed for years.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussions are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2106	485 - 18	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	Burnco is not adding to the value of this area by their project. Howe Sound is a recreational playground that attracts tourism dollars because of the pristine nature it is in.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2107	485 - 19	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	This Calgary based company is the only recipient of gain. Their websites boast areas that they have remediated successfully. However, it must be noted that they have never remediated a pristine environment. Who would hold them accountable?	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2108	485 - 20	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	The idea that they will build a berm of soil along the part of the creek closest to the gravel extraction, sounds good until you think about the dust and runoff from the berm will wash into the creek, and damage fish and insect life there.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2109	485 - 21	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	It will probably also silt up/kill fragile ancient glass sponges nearby in the ocean.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2110	485 - 22	Delena Angrignon	Squamish, BC	With what we know about the assets in Howe Sound from the David Suzuki project and the value of estuaries to the whole of Howe Sound, this project should not be provided with an EA certificate. We ask the BCEAO to reject this project.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2111	486 - 1	Glen Allan Stein	Squamish, BC	It's a destructive industry, no matter where the companies want to locate their mine. I'm totally against any and all mining operations allocated for here in the Howe Sound. I am a full time Squamish resident. We don't want any LNG facilities here either, so don't feel we're pinpointing your mining operation.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2112	487 - 1	Amanda	Bowen Island, BC	DO NOT destroy McNabb creek!!! This is so short sighted. The marine life that has finally had a chance to return to Howe Sound, should never be threatened again. Money won't buy the planet back once we destroy it!!!	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2113	488 - 1	Rob	Squamish, BC	No!!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2114	489 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Estuaries are fragile and provide vital habitat for flora and fauna, including salmon and many other species at risk. The return of cetaceans to Howe Sound in recent years is dependent on the health of Howe Sound waters, and estuaries such as McNab Creek contribute to Howe Sound's overall health. A gravel mine in such an delicate ecosystem will affect not only flora and fauna in the estuary itself, but also others dependent on these species, as well as the experience of those who recreate in these areas.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2115	489 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Estuaries are fragile and provide vital habitat for flora and fauna, including salmon and many other species at risk. The return of cetaceans to Howe Sound in recent years is dependent on the health of Howe Sound waters, and estuaries such as McNab Creek contribute to Howe Sound's overall health. A gravel mine in such an delicate ecosystem will affect not only flora and fauna in the estuary itself, but also others dependent on these species, as well as the experience of those who recreate in these areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2116	489 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Please don't risk the improved health of species in this area with the Burnco Aggregate Project. As someone who lives in this area because of its beautiful and healthy landscape, and has seen the Sound's return to health in recent years, I understand the importance of healthy surrounding land and waters as vital to the health, growth, and popularity of the Sunshine Coast, Squamish and the Lower Mainland as well.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2117	490 - 1	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	I am a stream keeper and Environmental photographer from Burnaby who has spent a lifetime hiking, fishing, photographing and exploring the Squamish area and Sound. I am also of Squamish and Leq a mel Nation ancestry. As a stream keeper for many years I have serious concerns with Burnco and a proposed large gravel mine just above the McNab Creek Estuary and literally in the direct watershed of this almost pristine watershed.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2118	490 - 2	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	The one issue that I am very educated and familiar with is sediment/silt issues in rivers, creeks and streams and how that can seriously harm and or kill juvenile and adult Salmon. You may have seen much of the media I have done lately and over the years with these serious issues in our Salmon creeks in Burnaby and my oil spill photos the past few years in the Vancouver Sun and other media outlets. I am working with some of the larger environmental groups and Salmon groups to help with these sediment/silt issues and large developments in and around Vancouver. Sediment and silt is a huge problem for Salmon, Cutthroat Trout and all other fish species year round and not just in the spawning season. It is also devastating for the sea life in the general area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2119	490 - 3	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	The one issue that I am very educated and familiar with is sediment/silt issues in rivers, creeks and streams and how that can seriously harm and or kill juvenile and adult Salmon. You may have seen much of the media I have done lately and over the years with these serious issues in our Salmon creeks in Burnaby and my oil spill photos the past few years in the Vancouver Sun and other media outlets. I am working with some of the larger environmental groups and Salmon groups to help with these sediment/silt issues and large developments in and around Vancouver. Sediment and silt is a huge problem for Salmon, Cutthroat Trout and all other fish species year round and not just in the spawning season. It is also devastating for the sea life in the general area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2120	490 - 4	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	The one issue that I am very educated and familiar with is sediment/silt issues in rivers, creeks and streams and how that can seriously harm and or kill juvenile and adult Salmon. You may have seen much of the media I have done lately and over the years with these serious issues in our Salmon creeks in Burnaby and my oil spill photos the past few years in the Vancouver Sun and other media outlets. I am working with some of the larger environmental groups and Salmon groups to help with these sediment/silt issues and large developments in and around Vancouver. Sediment and silt is a huge problem for Salmon, Cutthroat Trout and all other fish species year round and not just in the spawning season. It is also devastating for the sea life in the general area.	<p>Potential effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events have been assessed. The following potential accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events – and associated mitigation - are presented in Volume 3, Part G – Section 15.4.1 of the EAC Application/EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geohazards: Earthquake-related ground movements and land-based mass movements;</li> <li>- Power outages;</li> <li>- Accidental discharge of sediment or fines into watercourses;</li> <li>- Accidental hazardous material spills – Land and marine based; and</li> <li>- Vessel and barge accidents (e.g., barge capsizing). – Aggregate spills.</li> </ul> <p>Project residual effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2121	490 - 5	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	I am firmly opposed to this gravel mine and I am hoping it will be stopped dead in it's tracks ASAP.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2122	490 - 6	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	We only recently have the orcas, humpbacks, Dal's porpoise and pacific whited sided dolphins returning due to the herring and anchovies returning in this fragile sound. Let us keep it that way.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2123	490 - 7	John Preissl	Burnaby, BC	I will be doing a full photo tour of the entire area of the creek and estuary in the coming weeks to photo document this amazing salmon watershed area.	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2124	491 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lestock, SK	Please review application for EPA.we want to preserve all natural space this place provides.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2125	492 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I am against the gravel mine because it poses risks to wile salmon.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2126	493 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	I am strongly against the Burnco gravel mine. It will threaten the McNab estuary and create a lot of pollution in Howe Sound. Please prevent this terrible project from going ahead.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2127	494 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I am opposed to the proposed Burnco project at McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2128	494 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is only now recovering from decades of heavy industrial use. Let's not go backward on this recovery. The environmental impacts of the proposed project are simply too great to be justified for the use proposed.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2129	494 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound is not an appropriate location for this type of industrial activity.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2130	494 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I support the creation of a long term comprehensive land and water use plan for economic and social activities in the region that are compatible with sustainable uses of Howe Sound.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2131	495 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound has been through tough times and is finally living some of its former glory. With the closure of Woodfibre and Britannia Mine clean up efforts, species are returning to live, love, give birth, and play here. I worked in this are in the 80s and the beaches and intertidal and subtidal zones were a wasteland. Today I seen the return of rockfish, pipefish, greenlings, seaperch,salmon, steelhead and marine mammals such as seals, porpoises, dophins, and Orcas. Let us now continue our caring, connection, and stewardship of Howe Sound. Let's speak up for those beings who cannot. No gravel pit should be a part of the Sound. If you could ask the more than humans who make this place their home, they would agree. Thank you.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2132	496 - 1	Kevin Mizuno	Vancouver, BC	This needs to STOP!! We need to think more about the beauty of BC and the Environmental impact, then a gravel mine!!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2133	497 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	The Howe Sound which is on the southeast of the Strait of Georgia, and extends 42 kilometres to its head at Squamish with its beautiful network of fjords, is an amazing wilderness enjoyed by all locals and visitors alike, with unspoilt marine wildlife.  At McNab Creek valley which is located in the middle of the Howe Sound, is where Burnco is proposing to develop a 74+ acre pit, build an onsite crushing and processing plant, and produce 20+ million tonnes of aggregate per year over 16 + years. The project will create only 12 direct jobs.  To whose benefit is this proposed mine? To the:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2134	497 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life that exist in the Howe Sound and at McNab Creek?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2135	497 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife that is enjoyed by all around this area?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2136	497 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over \$300 million that Burnco will profit from by having 12 employees on site? Will it, in the long term benefit of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine? Or just Burnco?</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2137	497 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the numerous eagles nests that live in the McNab Creek area. Is it a benefit to their young that are protected under BC's laws and are sensitive to noise created by Burnco project?</li> <li>population of Roosevelt Elk that were transplanted to McNab Creek by the BC Ministry of Environment in the early 2000's?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2138	497 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	As you can see the benefit is clearly to Burnco. We need to speak for the future of all related to the Howe Sound Ecosystem and for those who cannot speak and act and ensure they protected and put a stop to the Burnco proposed aggregate mine at McNab Creek.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2139	498 - 1	Martin Kukla	Vancouver, BC	I am strongly opposing Burnco Aggregate Mine project. I think that we all live in 21st century where we all realize how important is to protect the environment we live in. Such a beautiful place is a gift to us and we should look after it. No more digging, logging and mining is needed. We don't have to develop every single place on earth.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2140	499 - 1	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	I am against the Burnco Aggregate Project. It is the wrong type of project for Howe Sound in terms of its environmental impacts on land, sea/water, and air, and on both marine and terrestrial biodiversity.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2141	499 - 2	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	Economically it is wrong and will severely undermine the fast growing, vibrant tourism industry (along with all the huge tanker traffic associated with the equally bad project, Wood Fibre LNG).	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2142	499 - 3	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	Economically it is wrong and will severely undermine the fast growing, vibrant tourism industry (along with all the huge tanker traffic associated with the equally bad project, Wood Fibre LNG).	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2143	499 - 4	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	Finally it contributes to climate change and is not warranted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.</p>
2144	499 - 5	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	Given the magnificence and uniqueness of Howe Sound, and that it is being proposed as a UNESCO Heritage area, it is a pity that the BC Government and the Federal Government are being so short-sighted in likely approving this project - on the basis of very limited short-term (dollar) gain for very long (environmental, biodiversity, health, and tourism) gain.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2145	499 - 6	Theodora Carroll	Howe Sound, BC	The majority of Howe Sound residents/citizens and municipalities have demonstrated clearly that they are against this project and it is hoped that for once the BC and Federal governments will listen to the majority rather than a very limited minority. Do NOT approve BurnCo Aggregate Project.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2146	500 - 1	Trevor Boudreau	Vancouver, BC	Burnco has done a good job responding to initial concerns and making changes to its plans in this revised application. I support moving forward with this project - as long as its operations can be done in a sustainable manner and environmental impacts can be mitigated. I also trust in the guidance of the Squamish First Nation upon whose traditional lands this project would be built.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2147	500 - 2	Trevor Boudreau	Vancouver, BC	Burnco has done a good job responding to initial concerns and making changes to its plans in this revised application. I support moving forward with this project - as long as its operations can be done in a sustainable manner and environmental impacts can be mitigated. I also trust in the guidance of the Squamish First Nation upon whose traditional lands this project would be built.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2148	501 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>McNab Creek is an unsuitable location for a gravel quarry.</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.</p> <p>In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at MdNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do.</p> <p>Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2149	502 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The fish habitat offset plan may not work.</p> <p>The proponent has no experience operating an aggregate mine in a marine environment. Contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine". The proposed "compensation channel" is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new stream-way, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2150	502 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The fish habitat offset plan may not work.</p> <p>The proponent has no experience operating an aggregate mine in a marine environment. Contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine". The proposed "compensation channel" is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new stream-way, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2151	503 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Grantham's Landing, BC	I am totally opposed to this gravel mine in a key salmon estuary in biologically sensitive Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2152	503 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Grantham's Landing, BC	For God's sake, the whales and dolphins are just coming back! Give nature a chance!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2153	503 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Grantham's Landing, BC	For God's sake, the whales and dolphins are just coming back! Give nature a chance!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2154	504 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations.</p> <p>Because of unsightliness, adverse effects on property values, and noise/dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have 1000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See:</p> <p><a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2155	504 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations.</p> <p>Because of unsightliness, adverse effects on property values, and noise/dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have 1000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See:</p> <p><a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2156	504 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations.</p> <p>Because of unsightliness, adverse effects on property values, and noise/dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have 1000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See:</p> <p><a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2157	504 - 4	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations.</p> <p>Because of unsightliness, adverse effects on property values, and noise/dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have 1000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See:</p> <p><a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2158	505 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of this mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application.</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Air quality monitoring, with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2159	506 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I am against the approval of the Burnco Aggregate Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2160	506 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I do not want to see this region become re-industrialised as it has taken 25 years for Howe Sound to return to being a viable ecosystem with the food chain returning from plankton on up to whales. That is the result of the closure of the Britannia Mine and its toxic consequence on Howe Sound. Why on earth would we want to jeopardize that return?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2161	506 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I believe this mine would contribute to the decline of the region's waterways.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2162	506 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I believe that tourism and its spinoffs benefit a far broader chunk of the population and is preferable than 12 supposed jobs created by the proposed project with all of the money going to Burnco. I am not against mining. I am against this particular project as I believe it is a poor fit for the region and the small community near the mine at McNab Creek.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2163	506 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I believe that tourism and its spinoffs benefit a far broader chunk of the population and is preferable than 12 supposed jobs created by the proposed project with all of the money going to Burnco. I am not against mining. I am against this particular project as I believe it is a poor fit for the region and the small community near the mine at McNab Creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2164	507 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2165	508 - 1	Harriet Hunter	Gibsons, BC	I definitely oppose the Burnco Aggregate Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2166	508 - 2	Harriet Hunter	Gibsons, BC	The fragile recovery of Howe Sound should not be a site of re-industrialization but should be a protected environment for marine life and human habitation.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2167	508 - 3	Harriet Hunter	Gibsons, BC	<p>The company's application does not show us that it is committed to careful management of its mining and processing operations in order to protect the surrounding marine and human environments.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2168	509 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application.</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts - tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the "science" work done by the Proponent.</p> <p>Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site. Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-arranged norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2169	510 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised</p> <p>The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2170	511 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2171	512 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2172	513 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Unsuitable location.</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area</p> <p>In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now? To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
2173	514 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Plant and dock lighting</p> <p>The McNab Creek area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant and dock lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-arranged norms.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects, including visual quality. Changes in visual quality considered the potential for cumulative effects related to vegetation clearing and the installation and operation of land-based and marine-based infrastructure and night-time security lighting to the landscape visible from selected receptor sites. The Visual Quality CEA is presented in Section 7.4.5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS. All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2174	515 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work.</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine"). The proposed "compensation channel" is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2175	515 - 2	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work.</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as "marine"). The proposed "compensation channel" is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2176	516 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	I am opposed to Burnco's McNab Creek mine proposal. I find their presentation unconvincing.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2177	516 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	The mine would be the last blow to a habitat already degraded by long term logging.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2178	516 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Keats Island, BC	This estuary is the last large undeveloped one on the Sound. It should be preserved and allowed to heal for the good of the marine and terrestrial wildlife as well as our ignorant human selves.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2179	517 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust:</p> <p>The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties. The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.</p>
2180	517 - 2	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust:</p> <p>The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties. The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2181	517 - 3	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust:</p> <p>The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties. The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2182	517 - 4	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Sightline, noise and dust:</p> <p>The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties. The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2183	518 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Please, please, please do not let the gravel mine become a reality. I currently live in Lions Bay and have grown up in Howe Sound my entire life. This beautiful part of BC should be a national marine park not some industrial endeavour.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2184	519 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2185	520 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application.</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent.</p> <p>Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site. Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2186	521 - 1	Kevin	Manning, AB	<p>Howe Sound is still in recovery from major industry in the last century. This gravel mine is not needed or vital to our province or city region in any way but having a natural jewel so close to the urban centre is for our tourism industry. Please give the sound more time to recover and decline Burnco's application.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2187	521 - 2	Kevin	Manning, AB	Howe Sound is still in recovery from major industry in the last century. This gravel mine is not needed or vital to our province or city region in any way but having a natural jewel so close to the urban centre is for our tourism industry. Please give the sound more time to recover and decline Burnco's application.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2188	522 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.  Removing sediment from the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, especially for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.  Siltation monitoring (in the original channel, compensation channels, and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where sediments/siltation exceeds pre-arranged norms.	Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.
2189	522 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.  Removing sediment from the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, especially for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.  Siltation monitoring (in the original channel, compensation channels, and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where sediments/siltation exceeds pre-arranged norms.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2190	522 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.</p> <p>Removing sediment from the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, especially for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (in the original channel, compensation channels, and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension, or cessation of mine activities where sediments/siltation exceeds pre-arranged norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2191	523 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Plant lighting.</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2192	524 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>
2193	524 - 2	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2194	524 - 3	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application.</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2195	525 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>“Daytime Hours” definition.</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during “daytime hours”. Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of “daytime hours” is unclear</p> <p>Clearly define “daytime hours” in the proposal</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2196	526 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable.</p> <p>Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, Increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2197	527 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Loss of property values in the nearby strata units.</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2198	528 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	<p>I aks you to reject the application as this proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2199	528 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	<p>I aks you to reject the application as this proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2200	528 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Furthermore the project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek, and would endanger marine species.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2201	528 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Furthermore the project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek, and would endanger marine species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2202	528 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Furthermore the project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek, and would endanger marine species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2203	529 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>"Daytime Hours" of operation definition.</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays, and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, so the statement of "daytime hours" is very unclear.</p> <p>Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR D noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2204	530 - 1	Wanda Nowicki	Gibsons, BC	Too many environmental risks! PERIOD.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2205	531 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow.</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and salt water intrusion will threaten its existence.</p> <p>For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
2206	532 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	No no no. Please Stop this madness	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2207	533 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound.</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent. The Howe Sound airshed is restricted, pollution from this increased heavy tugboat traffic will impact everyone along the route.</p> <p>A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2208	534 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Loss of property values in the nearby strata units.</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss.</p> <p>See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2209	534 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2210	536 - 1	Murray Skeels	Bowen Island, BC	<p>This project would provide gravel, a commodity readily available for extraction in a cost effective manner from many areas with quite low ecological values. This particular location is an extremely rich ecological area that will be destroyed by the project.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2211	536 - 2	Murray Skeels	Bowen Island, BC	<p>This project would provide gravel, a commodity readily available for extraction in a cost effective manner from many areas with quite low ecological values. This particular location is an extremely rich ecological area that will be destroyed by the project.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2212	536 - 3	Murray Skeels	Bowen Island, BC	This project would provide gravel, a commodity readily available for extraction in a cost effective manner from many areas with quite low ecological values. This particular location is an extremely rich ecological area that will be destroyed by the project.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2213	536 - 4	Murray Skeels	Bowen Island, BC	Only those who place very, very little value on the natural world would even contemplate the possibility that the benefit to be obtained from this giant gravel pit would outweigh the cost to our environment. Please reject this application. Murray Skeels Mayor, Bowen Island Municipality	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2214	537 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Preservation of marine tourism , hiking access to the vicinity of McNab.</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages , swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs.</p> <p>The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected.</p> <p>These amenities have a real and calculable economic value and their loss will impact the local economy. The proposal does not identify how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>
2215	538 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>First Nation consultation – Sechelt First Nation was omitted. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt First Nation.</p> <p>The Sechelt First Nation wasn't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either, and this was part of SCR D saying no re a gravel quarry there in 2009.</p> <p>Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2216	539 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>End-of-project remediation</p> <p>Experience in the BC mining industry has shown escalating costs of end of project remediation.</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end. Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement. This should be funded by an environmental bond established at the start of project, and assessed an increased during the project to ensure sufficient funds for proper remediation when the project ends.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2217	540 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Loss of property values in the nearby strata units.</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas.</p> <p>Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-islet-controversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2218	541 - 1	Steve Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Here is a great example of where the Howe Sound could be headed if looking at more positive industries down the road.  <a href="http://www.squamishchief.com/news/local-news/400-million-all-season-resort-in-works-1.2220168">http://www.squamishchief.com/news/local-news/400-million-all-season-resort-in-works-1.2220168</a>                      This type of resort/investment (\$400 Million) proposal does not come to many rural communities in Canada but is being proposed for Howe Sound! People are starting to recognize it's amazing beauty. Since the long process of cleaning-up after Britannia, there are finally more sustainable recreation and resort proposals coming to the Howe Sound which will have so many more economic, sociological and environmental benefits to the region than a gravel mine!                      Please consider a more positive future!!</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2219	542 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens.</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement by SCRD was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens - as part of the proposal for this project.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
2220	543 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>End-of-project remediation</p> <p>Experience in the BC mining industry has shown escalating costs of end of project remediation.</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end. Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement. This should be funded by an environmental bond established at the start of project, and assessed an increased during the project to ensure sufficient funds for proper remediation when the project ends.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2221	544 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA .</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the NET job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs minus job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2222	545 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Just don't do it!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2223	546 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential, and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound.</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas: significant recreational and small business boat traffic (that will only grow over time), the Howe Sound Marine Trail, ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant, and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2224	547 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The job benefits analysis for BURNCO used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project.</p> <p>For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Re-do the employment estimates and repost/allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments.</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>
2225	548 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses for BURNCO.</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25 years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several TIMES that amount.</p> <p>This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment.</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2226	549 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Preservation of marine tourism and hiking access to the vicinity of McNab.</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs.</p> <p>The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>
2227	550 - 1	Anne	Sunshine Coast, BC	I am 100% against the Burnco Mine. The McNab Valley it too important to spoil with a gravel pit. Our family has been enjoying this incredible & unique area of Howe Sound since the 90's. Some of my most favorite memories were created at McNab Creek.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2228	550 - 2	Anne	Sunshine Coast, BC	Crabbing, fishing, wakeboarding, tubing, the list goes on and on.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2229	550 - 3	Anne	Sunshine Coast, BC	Future generations would miss out on so much if they allow an industry like a gravel pit to operate here; especially the wildlife!	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2230	550 - 4	Anne	Sunshine Coast, BC	Future generations would miss out on so much if they allow an industry like a gravel pit to operate here; especially the wildlife!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2231	550 - 5	Anne	Sunshine Coast, BC	It's certainly not worth 12 jobs. No to Burnco!	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2232	551 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>End-of-project remediation.</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Restoring the natural stream-way should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2233	552 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The application seems to think that in terms of socio-economic impacts, BURNCO is too far from Woodfibre LNG to have any interaction. However, both facilities are in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor, and are all part of Howe Sound.</p> <p>The many tourists travelling to Whistler experience the Sound as a contiguous area that has a positive transition from over-industrialization in Vancouver - back to natural beauty in Howe Sound. Many new business and residents have arrived precisely because of this natural beauty.</p> <p>A return of multiple significant industrial projects on Howe Sound should be evaluated for cumulative impacts, especially on tourism, and the region's natural brand.</p> <p>An assessment that fails to recognize that all development in the Sound impacts the whole Sound is seriously flawed.</p> <p>The assessment also makes absolutely no mention of the new compressor station planned for Mt. Mulligan which is again further re-industrialization of the area. Any significant shift in economic basis will have impacts, but these have not been addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2234	553 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The application does not seem to address the approved Woodfibre LNG cooling system. Cetaceans and fish alike travel the whole Sound. Although these facilities have distance between them, they represent a growing collection of stresses on fish, marine mammals, and other wildlife that travel the whole Sound.</p> <p>The cumulative stress needs to be addressed. We're not dealing with goldfish that stay confined to a little bowl.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2235	553 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>The application does not seem to address the approved Woodfibre LNG cooling system. Cetaceans and fish alike travel the whole Sound. Although these facilities have distance between them, they represent a growing collection of stresses on fish, marine mammals, and other wildlife that travel the whole Sound.</p> <p>The cumulative stress needs to be addressed. We're not dealing with goldfish that stay confined to a little bowl.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2236	554 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>A full cumulative assessment of the effects of industry in Howe Sound really needs to be done.</p> <p>The geography of the Sound makes it a funnel for pollution, and even today we see a concentration of pollution from the Lower Mainland funnel up through Squamish on some Summer days.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts assessment fails to take the impacts on Squamish from the BURNCO operations.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts assessment fails to address the additional impacts from the proposed Mt. Mulligan compressor (run on natural gas).</p> <p>Mt. Garibaldi has also been excluded, and yet it represents a significant addition to regional traffic (pollution) and thus Howe Sound pollution.</p> <p>An air quality assessment needs to consider how pollutants travel in the whole Sound, and the cumulative impacts of all major projects.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2237	555 - 1	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	<p>Please do allow Burnco to move forward with there development plans. You must consider the estuary at McNab Creek, including the Salmon, and other at danger species.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2238	555 - 2	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	Please do allow Burnco to move forward with there development plans. You must consider the estuary at McNab Creek, including the Salmon, and other at danger species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2239	555 - 3	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	Please do allow Burnco to move forward with there development plans. You must consider the estuary at McNab Creek, including the Salmon, and other at danger species.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2240	555 - 4	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	As well as the need for more aggregate in this region.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2241	555 - 5	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	Please consider that there is not enough data to do this environment assessment.	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2242	555 - 6	Allison Redding	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is now a diverse and thriving ecosystem after surviving Britannia Mines decades ago, as well as the other industry on the Sound. As a local resident please take all these really important issues into consideration.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2243	556 - 1	Barry Hynes	Gibsons, BC	I have walked McNab creek extensively. It is a important salmon run.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2244	556 - 2	Barry Hynes	Gibsons, BC	We don't want this Burnco project in howe sound. It will destroy a beautiful area that is recovering well from previous human destruction. Please do not approve this project!!!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2245	557 - 1	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2246	557 - 2	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2247	557 - 3	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2248	557 - 4	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.  The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.  The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2249	557 - 5	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2250	557 - 6	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. on a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
2251	558 - 1	Kevin Davie	Sechelt, BC	The Burnco gravel mine should be approved with no more stringent standards than three other gravel extraction operations have.	Thank you for your submission. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2252	558 - 2	Kevin Davie	Sechelt, BC	Gravel is certainly needed mostly use on the Lower Mainland for construction.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2253	558 - 3	Kevin Davie	Sechelt, BC	This location will result in less GHGs released than trying to bring in other gravel from sources farther away.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.</p>
2254	559 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	No Gravel mine on Howe Sound! Protect supernatural BC. Protect species living in Howe Sound!	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2255	560 - 1	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	My name is Sam Wainwright and I am the owner of Lot #30 on Gambier Island. This lot is directly across from the proposed Bunco Site. I have owned this site for over 10 years.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2256	560 - 2	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	I am completely against the development of the Burnco Mine Project and have been since it was first preposed. Over the past 10 years I have watched the growth and return of our natural wildlife come back into the region. This includes fish, birds, crabs, dolphins & whales! This area is treasure of the BC Coast line and needs to be treated as such.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2257	560 - 3	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	My family and 100's & thousands of others treat and respect these marine parks as the jewel and where they spend their most precious time with their family & friends to enjoy and admire its beauty.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2258	560 - 4	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	To allow Bunco to roll out their mining project would be devastating to the area, it neighbours and most importantly the wild life! We can lot let this happen!	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
2259	560 - 5	Sam Wainwright	Gambier Island, BC	The BC government must lead the way and put a stop to project such as these. They must be part of leading the world towards a more beautiful, green environment where people, nature, and wildlife can all live together and enjoy its beauty. I Sam Wainwright of LOT #30 on Gambier Island which is located directly across from Burnco preposed site STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH ALLOWING THE BURNCO MINE TO OPERATE.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2260	561 - 1	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>This letter is being submitted in connection with your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products regarding its proposal to create an open pit mine at the McNab Creek estuary.</p> <p>Douglas Bay Strata Corp. is comprised of the owners of a 53 lot recreational property strata development situated at the north end of Gambier Island. We are situated directly across Thornbrough Channel from McNab Creek and many of our owners' lots face directly out to McNab Creek and the proposed aggregate mine. Our community is a family based development whose owners have been drawn to the location due to its natural beauty and the ability to escape urban distractions while enjoying the recreational opportunities that this area offers to the residents of Howe Sound and all of Metro Vancouver.</p> <p>Next to the McNab Creek Estates Strata, we are the community that will be most directly affected by this proposed mine and we are very concerned about this proposal.</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2261	561 - 2	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>We believe that it is completely inconsistent with the established use of this area and the values and objectives of local communities. It will significantly degrade the social and cultural values of both the local area and Howe Sound as a whole. The establishment of a pit mine in an environmentally sensitive area just when Howe Sound is recovering from years of industrial abuse will have immeasurable social costs not only for residents of Howe Sound but also for the whole of the Lower Mainland.</p> <p>Howe Sound is a remarkable and unique region and the McNab Creek area is the heart of Howe Sound. Although it is only 45 minutes from Vancouver, it is worlds away from a metropolitan city. The ability to readily experience the great outdoors at its best is one of the things that makes Vancouver one of the world's most livable cities. The social value of allowing residents and visitors to enjoy outdoor recreational activities so easily cannot be readily measured, but it cannot be ignored in assessing the true cost of a project of this nature.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2262	561 - 3	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	In addition to the established communities who will suffer if this project is approved, there are also two yacht club out-stations that will be directly impacted. In addition, there are three youth camps in the immediate vicinity and numerous other youth camps in and around Howe Sound who travel to the McNab creek area for day and overnight trips. These camps have been attracting young people to the region for more than fifty years. They provide the youth of the Lower Mainland with an opportunity to get away from urban areas and experience the great outdoors. Many Lower Mainland children get their first wilderness experience at these camps. To allow an open pit mine to operate in the epicentre of this natural experience would destroy the very reason that people are attracted to the area. People come here to experience the outdoors without the noise and visual pollution that we all have to deal with in our everyday lives. The social cost of allowing this project to proceed will be immense.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation effects - including youth camps - are considered in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2263	561 - 4	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Federal, provincial and local governments have spent millions of dollars promoting the Sea to Sky Corridor internationally as an outdoor tourism destination. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on developing infrastructure to support the growing tourism activities in the region. This taxpayer money has been spent for the purpose of attracting tourists and outdoor enthusiasts from around the world to come to this region. These efforts have met with considerable success and Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky corridor are now ranked as one of the premier outdoor tourist destinations in the world. Approving a pit mine in an environmentally sensitive area in the centre of this region will undermine these efforts at significant cost to the public.</p> <p>As property owners in the area, we understand what McNab Creek and Howe Sound offer to all residents of the Lower Mainland. In the future, in order to maintain its position as one of the most livable cities in the world, Metro Vancouver's growing population will need to have continued access to the outdoor experiences that many of us have grown up with and have taken for granted. Howe Sound provides unique opportunities not found elsewhere in the world. In Howe Sound, both residents and visitors can experience the great outdoors in a manner that is affordable, with incredible ease of access. Preservation of this natural advantage will allow Metro Vancouver to retain its reputation as one of the most livable cities in the world. A failure to retain this unique advantage will result in a huge social cost that has not been taken into account in Burnco's Environmental Impact Study. Not only will there be a direct cost</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2264	561 - 5	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>For years, Howe Sound suffered through environmental abuse. Over the past few decades, hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended in remediating Howe Sound. These expenditures have led to recovering herring and salmon populations and, for the first time in decades, orcas, white-sided dolphins and humpback whales have returned to the Sound.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2265	561 - 6	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	Not only is this incredibly encouraging from an environmental perspective, it will play a key role in attracting more tourism and outdoor enthusiasts to the area and will help promote investment in the region.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2266	561 - 7	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	The Department of Fisheries and Oceans is on record as opposing this project due to the harmful effect it will have on critical fish habitat and has assessed the project as High Risk. The DFO has also stated that the options for compensation in the Howe Sound region are severely limited.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2267	561 - 8	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	This proposed project provides little or no tangible benefit to the region yet it could imperil the remediation results that has been achieved through large expenditures of both public and private funds.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2268	561 - 9	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	To jeopardize the environmental recovery that is occurring in the Sound with a project that involves high risks to salmon, freshwater and marine habitat cannot be justified.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2269	561 - 10	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	Clearly, allowing the development of an open pit mine in the heart of this region will be counter-productive to both the ongoing environmental remediation efforts as well as the region's reputation as an eco-tourism and outdoor recreational destination of choice. The cost to the region and taxpayers will be enormous while the benefits will be marginal. This project will result in little or no infrastructure to benefit the region and is only projected to create twelve jobs, which may well come with the loss of jobs in other areas including at the aggregate supply sites and shipping facilities currently used by Burnco.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2270	561 - 11	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	Clearly, allowing the development of an open pit mine in the heart of this region will be counter-productive to both the ongoing environmental remediation efforts as well as the region's reputation as an eco-tourism and outdoor recreational destination of choice. The cost to the region and taxpayers will be enormous while the benefits will be marginal. This project will result in little or no infrastructure to benefit the region and is only projected to create twelve jobs, which may well come with the loss of jobs in other areas including at the aggregate supply sites and shipping facilities currently used by Burnco.	BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
2271	561 - 12	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	Although we cannot see how this project can be justified at any level, we also have specific concerns about the Environmental Impact Study that has been submitted. As a general comment, in reviewing the report that has been submitted, it seems that many of the concerns raised in the initial public comment period for the AIR have been discounted or dismissed without adequate analysis to substantiate the conclusions reached or, in some cases, ignored completely.	Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.  Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.
2272	561 - 13	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	1. Burnco attempts to justify this project on the basis that the mine will help meet the Lower Mainland's demand for gravel. However there is no analysis of the available supply from existing locations or from other less environmentally sensitive sites. Burnco's own demands can easily be met from its existing suppliers and industry reports indicate that the currently identified supply sources in the Lower Mainland are sufficient to meet Metro Vancouver's demand requirements for in excess of 100 years.. Burnco is only choosing to proceed with this project based on its own cost structure while ignoring the environmental, social and economic costs of this project that will be borne by the public.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2273	561 - 14	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>2. The various components of the study have almost invariably been based on assumptions as to the scope and operating hours for the project. However we are very concerned about relying on studies which are based on these assumptions. Burnco's original proposal was based on a much larger pit mine which it intended to operate on a 24/7 basis.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project life has been reduced from 20-30 years to 16 years, and the maximum depth of excavation has been reduced from 55 metres to 35 metres;</li> <li>- There are no proposed discharges to, or withdrawals from, McNab Creek;</li> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Reduced the size of the pit lake as the northern edge has been moved away from the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke.</li> <li>- Pit lake designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. The elevation of the pit lake will also be used to manage base flows in the natural groundwater watercourses below the pit lake.</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Areas progressively reclaimed during the operational phase will be re-vegetated to control erosion.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> <li>- Replaced wash water sedimentation ponds and associated discharges with a 95% efficient wash plant that uses recycled water from two large storage tanks. The 5% loss (via retention, evaporation and absorption) will be supplemented with make-up water from a ground water well. No wash water will be discharged.</li> <li>- Fines generated from the crushing, screening, washing of material will be extracted from the wash water and mechanically dried and compressed into sediment cakes which will be used in progressive reclamation of the onsite fines disposal area.</li> <li>- Covered or enclosed Project components and/or operating under wet conditions (e.g., fine water spray) to reduced potential</li> </ul>
2274	561 - 15	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>At the 2013 open house, a senior Burnco representative openly stated that the company's long-term intentions were to expand the mine operations even beyond what they were presenting at that time. We are very concerned that the project scope as set out in the EIS has been designed to facilitate obtaining initial approval for the project knowing that any application for future expansion will not be subject to the same level of assessment or review. The underlying reports contained in the EIS do not properly assess the potential environmental, social or economic impact that the project will ultimately have since the reports are predicated on assumptions regarding the scope of the project which may well severely understate the ultimate size of the project.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2275	561 - 16	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	At the 2013 open house, a senior Burnco representative openly stated that the company's long-term intentions were to expand the mine operations even beyond what they were presenting at that time. We are very concerned that the project scope as set out in the EIS has been designed to facilitate obtaining initial approval for the project knowing that any application for future expansion will not be subject to the same level of assessment or review. The underlying reports contained in the EIS do not properly assess the potential environmental, social or economic impact that the project will ultimately have since the reports are predicated on assumptions regarding the scope of the project which may well severely understate the ultimate size of the project.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
2276	561 - 17	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	3. The analysis of the potential noise impacts is based on assessment parameters regarding acceptable levels of noise in industrial or urban environments. Those measurements are clearly inappropriate for an area which is home to outdoor youth camps and residential communities and whose fundamental nature and attraction is dependent on retaining the characteristics of a wilderness location. The impact of noise on this unique, outdoor recreational area should not be measured by what is considered acceptable levels of noise in industrial or urban areas.	The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: "A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment."  McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.
2277	561 - 18	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	4. We also have great difficulty with the assertion that the noise levels will not be audible on Gambier Island and have to question the validity of a report that arrives at that conclusion. Our on the ground experience is that machinery operating at McNab is clearly audible in our community. The McNab Valley operates as a natural amphitheatre and sound carries across the water unimpeded. The noise that will be generated from the barge loading activity is of particular concern. There will be no sound buffer areas to limit the impact of the noise from the barge loading area and the noise will carry directly across the channel. From direct first-hand experience, we know that the noise level from barges loading and unloading at McNab Creek is enough to wake up our residents during the night.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2278	561 - 19	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>5. We also question the validity of the conclusion that there will be no cumulative impact from noise when the consultants at the recent open house presentations on the EIS were not even aware of the Box Canyon power project which is now operating in the valley. The noise studies were completed before the power project came on-line and the consultants indicated that the noise created by the Box Creek operations was not even taken into account in the cumulative impact study. Clearly, this brings into question the validity of any conclusions as to cumulative noise impacts that are contained in the report.</p>	<p>Cumulative effects due to noise were not assessed because the significance of the noise VC was Negligible, Not Significant. This approach to cumulative effects assessment is consistent with accepted EA practice in BC and Canada.</p> <p>The cumulative contribution of noise from the Box Canyon project is expected to be minimal, based on previous assessments of run-of-river projects (e.g. Narrows Inlet Hydro Project, 2012).</p>
2279	561 - 20	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>6. In its draft AIR, Burnco committed to reporting on the status of consultations with private land owners and tenure holders. However, in Volume 4, Section 21 of the report, there is little evidence that Burnco fulfilled its commitments in this regard. At section 21.2.4.1 - Social Conditions, the listing of Personal Communications shows a dearth of communications with any of the local constituents who will be affected by the proposed project. To our knowledge no-one from Burnco attempted to contact anyone at Douglas Bay even though we comprise the largest private land-holding in the area and will be directly impacted if the project proceeds. It seems clear that the background research undertaken in with respect to the potential social impacts of the project was deficient and so the conclusions reached in the reports must be viewed with great scepticism. From the comments published on the BC EAO website the vast majority of the public has significant concerns about the social impacts of this project but there has been little effort made by Burnco to communicate with communities or stakeholders who will be affected to properly assess the true social costs of the project or its impact on the surrounding communities.</p>	<p>During Pre-Application, BURNCO provided responses to issues identified in a written submission on the EAC Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidements provided by the Douglas Bay Strata Corp. on October 19, 2013. In addition, BURNCO responded to pre-application issues identified in seven (7) submissions on the EAC Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidements from individuals who self-identified as being from Douglas Bay, BC. Documentation of consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Douglas Bay Strata Corp. is included in BURNCO's list of identified public stakeholders. In August 2016, upon filing the EAC Application/EIS, a letter was sent to all identified public stakeholders - including the President of the Douglas Bay Strata Council - to provide notification about the upcoming stages of the EA review and opportunities for public comment. The letter also provided information about upcoming Public Information Sessions and opportunities to meet with members of BURNCO's team to answer questions about the proposed Project. The EAC Application/EIS was available to public review from August 4 to the closure of the Public Comment Period on October 3, 2016.</p> <p>During Application Review, BURNCO has provided responses to issues identified in a written submission on the EAC Application/EIS provided by the Douglas Bay Strata Corp. on October 3, 2016. No additional comments on the EAC Application/EIS were received from individuals who self-identified as being from Douglas Bay, BC.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2280	561 - 21	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>6. In its draft AIR, Burnco committed to reporting on the status of consultations with private land owners and tenure holders. However, in Volume 4, Section 21 of the report, there is little evidence that Burnco fulfilled its commitments in this regard. At section 21.2.4.1 - Social Conditions, the listing of Personal Communications shows a dearth of communications with any of the local constituents who will be affected by the proposed project. To our knowledge no-one from Burnco attempted to contact anyone at Douglas Bay even though we comprise the largest private land-holding in the area and will be directly impacted if the project proceeds. It seems clear that the background research undertaken in with respect to the potential social impacts of the project was deficient and so the conclusions reached in the reports must be viewed with great scepticism. From the comments published on the BC EAO website the vast majority of the public has significant concerns about the social impacts of this project but there has been little effort made by Burnco to communicate with communities or stakeholders who will be affected to properly assess the true social costs of the project or its impact on the surrounding communities.</p>	<p>Phone based interviews are cited as personal communications (pers.comm.) within the text of the EAC Application/EIS and details included in the references (Part G, Section 21). The sample of key informants was not intended to be exhaustive of all stakeholders potentially affected by the Proposed Project, but rather was intended to be wide ranging enough to confirm and expand information available from the referenced secondary sources. Key informants interviewed or provided data for this report included representatives from recreational groups and tourism operators, as well as DFO and MFLNRO. The list of key informants included the following: Burrard Yacht Club, Coastal Inlet Adventures, District of Squamish, Don's Water Taxi, Gambier Island Local Trust, Gibsons and District Chamber of Commerce, Gibsons Landing Inn, Irwin Motel, Islands Trust, McNab Creek Strata, Sewell's Marina, Squamish Yacht Club, Sunshine Kayaking, Thunderbird Yacht Club, Recreation Sites and Trails BC and West Vancouver Fire &amp; Rescue Services.</p>
2281	561 - 22	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>7. Although we expressed concern during the comment period on the AIR that the proponent's visual and aesthetic viewpoints were inadequate as they were almost entirely based on sea level assessment locations, the assessments that were conducted did not include any height of land assessment sites in the neighbouring communities. We are very concerned that the results do not properly assess the impact on our owners, a number of whose lots or building sites are at heights above sea level and look directly at the project location. This is another example of where the concerns of neighbouring communities have not been properly reviewed or assessed in the studies undertaken by Burnco.</p>	<p>The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the local residents, particularly residents of the McNab Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. Viewing locations and/or viewing conditions assessed are limited to publicly accessible sites that represent key viewing opportunities that would be experienced by the greatest number of people within the Local Study Area. In many cases, these viewpoints are from sea level, considering recreation marine use, facilities and shorefront residents. However there are also some upland locations included in the assessment (e.g. Lions Bay) which provide a sense of how higher view angles would affect the visual impacts. Generally, increasing the view angle at certain or reasonably foreseeable mid-ground viewing opportunities would likely have a minor effect on increased visibility of the Project site considering the screening effect of vegetation surrounding the Project.</p> <p>Viewpoints 2, 3, and 5 reflect a range of viewing distances which might be experienced near the northern portion of Gambier Island and viewing conditions which might be experienced by most residents of the Strata. For each of these viewpoints, the level of visual impact is characterized as low. While portions of the marine facilities are likely to be discernable, proposed mitigation (e.g. retaining foreshore vegetation) will reduce potential effects by providing screening and reducing the level of visual contrast with the existing landscape.</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2282	561 - 23	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>8. In a number of areas, the EIS identifies potential environmental impacts of the project but suggests that these can be managed by “best management practices” and the adoption of “Best Management Plans”. We have significant concerns about approving a development with identified environmental risks based on an assumption that best management practices will be followed. There is little or no ability to ensure compliance with this commitment and so the risks associated with the project that have been discounted by the assumption that best practices will be followed are in fact very real risks that should be fully evaluated. At the recent Open House, Scott Burns responded to concerns about impacts on wildlife corridors and the neighbouring community by saying “it’s our land, we’ll do what we want.” If this is the attitude of Burnco’s senior management, it hardly gives confidence that Burnco is committed to best practices. Our concern in this regard is heightened by the experience of residents in the housing community adjacent to Burnco’s aggregate mine at Cougar Ridge near Calgary, Alberta, where Burnco has declined to follow best practices or adopt mitigation strategies that would reduce the impact of its operations on neighbouring land owners. To simply dismiss potential risks by assuming that best management practises will be followed is unacceptable particularly when there is little or no ability to enforce the use of best practices once the project has been approved.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2283	561 - 24	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>9. The EIS contains little evaluative data on what the impact of the project will have on adjoining land values. The residents of the McNab strata development immediately adjacent to the project site will be the most directly impacted. Anecdotal evidence is that since Burnco announced its development plans, property values for McNab Valley residents have plummeted. One realtor who is knowledgeable in the market has commented that if the project proceeds the McNab properties will likely be worth a fraction of their former value, if they will even be saleable at all. Since Burnco's development plans were announced, the spectre of a gravel mine being built has dampened the market considerably and our development has experienced a similar, though less pronounced, decline in value of the lots in our community. Burnco has not undertaken any proper evaluation or quantification of the cost impact that the project would have on neighbouring properties or the loss of property tax revenues that will result from the decreased land values.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2284	561 - 25	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>10. The proponent downplays the current value of the McNab Creek area as salmon bearing habitat. However our experience in the last few years is that there has been a marked recovery in the salmon stocks. The analysis of the area from a fisheries perspective that has been provided by the proponent should be examined with great scrutiny. It certainly appears to us, and to others with historical knowledge of the area, that the McNab Creek environment is experiencing the same recovery that is being seen in the rest of Howe Sound and this project can only result in a severe set-back.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2285	561 - 26	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>11. It is our understanding from speaking with the consultants at the recent open house, that the models used for noise and dust assessment are based on averaging the anticipated impact. This would seem to us to be inappropriate and would mask the true impact of the project. Any modelling should be based on the peak level operating conditions in order to properly assess what impact the project will have.</p>	<p>In the absence of formal guidance, the environmental noise from the Project was assessed in accordance with noise regulations specified by the BC Oil and Gas Commission in the document British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline, by Health Canada in Useful Information for Environmental Assessments, and in the SCRD's Noise Control Bylaw. These guidelines do not provide noise limits for peak sound levels. Energy equivalent noise level (Leq) measurements and noise limits include all of the acoustic energy including any noise peaks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2286	561 - 27	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>12. We are concerned about the impact of dust on the area. Burnco downplays this issue by claiming that the pit dredging will not create dust and that it will use covered conveyors. However the Air Quality analysis does show particulates spreading out into Thornbrough Channel. The area can be exposed to extreme winds and there often are in-flow or out-flow wind conditions that can be highly variable and undoubtedly will spread the particulates over an area that is larger than the average areas depicted in the presentations. These particulates will necessarily fall in the surrounding marine areas and settle as sediment. It is incongruous to us that the Air Quality report shows particulate impact over the marine areas yet the marine assessment blithely asserts that there will be no sediment created by the operations and discounts any impact to the marine environment based on this assumption of no sediment being created. It seems that the proponent has not even considered its own assessment results developed in one context when reporting on another area of impact.</p>	<p>The air quality dispersion model predictions presented in Figures 5.7-2, 5.7-3, 5.7-4 and 5.7-5 represent in-air concentrations of particulate matter fractions and not predictions of dust deposition; the concentrations presented do not represent dust plumes. In addition, the dispersion modelling methods and associated assumptions - approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) - incorporated a high degree of conservatism. The air dispersion model was based on worst case daily emission rates and assumed worst case daily emissions every day of the year. These assumptions contributed to the high level of confidence in the air quality assessment predictions that there will no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The same Ministry-approved CALPUFF model that was used to predict air quality concentrations (i.e., run in dynamic [3D] mode with a fine resolution meteorological data set) was used to predict deposition rates which were incorporated into the surface water quality model and the assessment of potential effects on water quality and aquatic health. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2287	561 - 28	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>13. It is very surprising to us that Burnco views the risk of flooding or debris flow as negligible. The McNab Valley is known for its heavy rainfalls and McNab Creek is rated as a high velocity creek. Log and debris dams and resultant debris floods are common in the Howe Sound region with Environment Canada's website recognizing Howe Sound as a hazard area for debris floods. A paper by Andree Blais-Stevens (Geological Survey of Canada) and Oldrich Hungr (Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of BC) states that over the last 150 years, hundreds of landslide events have been reported in the Sea to Sky Corridor with landslide activity peaking at approximately 40 events per decade in the 1980's and 1990's. They also note that almost 18% of all of Canada's landslide deaths have occurred in the Sea to Sky Corridor. Based on this type of readily available information regarding the risks of debris flows or flooding and our own experience from living in the region, it is baffling to us to see that Burnco's assessment concludes that any risk in this regard is negligible without any explanation as to how the conclusion has been reached or substantiated.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p>
2288	561 - 29	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>14. This project will result in increased barge traffic in the area based on average levels of vessel traffic in Howe Sound. The report concludes that the impact will not be significant based on overall vessel traffic in the region. However this area is home to two recreational boaters' outstations and is extensively used by recreational boaters, kayakers and others. This small vessel activity includes frequent travel in canoes or kayaks by children from the neighbouring camps. The barge routes also directly transect the new marine trail which runs along the east side of Gambier Island and through the McNab Creek vicinity. This route is expected to attract a large number of canoeists, kayakers and other boaters. The small vessel traffic in this area will continue to increase, perhaps dramatically, on an ongoing basis. The study does not properly address the nature and volume of the vessel traffic in the localized area and the potential safety impact that increased barge traffic could have, particularly in the summer months.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2289	561 - 30	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	We are very concerned about the significant negative impacts that this project will have on the communities in Howe Sound, residents of Metro Vancouver and on tourism and recreation in the region. The project poses clear environmental risks as well as significant economic, social, heritage and health effects while providing little benefit to the economy or communities of the region. There will be significant social and economic costs borne by neighbouring communities and the general public that have not been factored into the impact assessment that has been submitted by Burnco.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2290	561 - 31	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	We fail to see how the goals of environmental, economic and social sustainability for Howe Sound can be achieved if this project receives approval. We can only hope that the responsible authorities will recognize the true value of McNab Creek and the Howe Sound region and will not let the bottom line priority of one Alberta company outweigh the interests of the citizens of British Columbia.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2291	561 - 32	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	We fail to see how the goals of environmental, economic and social sustainability for Howe Sound can be achieved if this project receives approval. We can only hope that the responsible authorities will recognize the true value of McNab Creek and the Howe Sound region and will not let the bottom line priority of one Alberta company outweigh the interests of the citizens of British Columbia.	BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.  BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.  BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.
2292	561 - 33	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	If this project is approved, which would be a travesty, then there must be enforceable conditions imposed which ensure that the scope of the operation is not extended beyond what has been represented in the EIS. To fail to strictly enforce the representations and commitments made in Burnco's proposal or to allow any subsequent amendments which could result in an expanded scope or extended operating hours would make a mockery of the process.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2293	561 - 34	Douglas Bay Strata Corp.	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Proper safeguards need to be imposed to ensure that the characterizations used for the purposes of this application are honoured in practice. The proponent should be required to grant restrictive covenants in favour of McNab Creek Estates, our Strata Corporation and the yacht clubs (all of whom will be dramatically impacted by this proposal) which include operating restrictions consistent with the representations made in this application. It is only through registered covenants in favour of the adjoining land owners that the representations and commitments given in the approval process can be properly monitored and enforced.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>DOUGLAS BAY STRATA CORP, BSC 1539</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2294	562 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Abstract: Taking into consideration the volume of concerns expressed by residents, together with the uncertainties and ambiguities associated with the proposed Burnco Aggregate Project, the sensible conclusion is such that the Project should either not be approved, or in the alternative, it should be placed under a moratorium at this stage. The far reaching "Howe Sound UNESCO Biosphere Region Initiative " is worthy of careful and serious consideration prior to any action likely to compromise its national and international value.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2295	562 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Having substantial concerns regarding various proposals to increase the industrialization of Howe Sound, I have attended meetings held locally by Burnco, a proponent for a gravel and sand quarry/mine at McNabb Creek, as well as presentations by other proponents of industrialization. I have read most of the submissions made to the B.C. Environmental Assessment Office concerning the Burnco Project. Based on the material that I have studied, my initial concerns regarding the Burnco Project are well founded, and are in agreement with the sentiments expressed by many other authors. I wish to support the opinions of many of these authors, quoting or paraphrasing what they have written:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Howe Sound has many attributes threatened by industrialization;</li> </ul>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2296	562 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Howe Sound is a beautiful place, wild, remote, a recreational and tourist mecca, only 30-60 minutes away from most of populous Metro Vancouver;</li> <li>- Howe Sound epitomises our "Beautiful British Columbia" national pride of place;</li> <li>- Howe Sound is recovering from the damage caused to its ecology by previous industrialization activities, a recovery made possible by an infusion of taxpayer's dollars as well as dedicated hours of volunteer effort;</li> <li>- The McNabb Creek provides rich stream waters to fertilize the productive ecology of the ocean, an ecology still recovering from past logging and pulp mill practices;</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2297	562 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Howe Sound is a beautiful place, wild, remote, a recreational and tourist mecca, only 30-60 minutes away from most of populous Metro Vancouver;</li> <li>- Howe Sound epitomises our "Beautiful British Columbia" national pride of place;</li> <li>- Howe Sound is recovering from the damage caused to its ecology by previous industrialization activities, a recovery made possible by an infusion of taxpayer's dollars as well as dedicated hours of volunteer effort;</li> <li>- The McNabb Creek provides rich stream waters to fertilize the productive ecology of the ocean, an ecology still recovering from past logging and pulp mill practices;</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2298	562 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Howe Sound is a beautiful place, wild, remote, a recreational and tourist mecca, only 30-60 minutes away from most of populous Metro Vancouver;</li> <li>- Howe Sound epitomises our "Beautiful British Columbia" national pride of place;</li> <li>- Howe Sound is recovering from the damage caused to its ecology by previous industrialization activities, a recovery made possible by an infusion of taxpayer's dollars as well as dedicated hours of volunteer effort;</li> <li>- The McNabb Creek provides rich stream waters to fertilize the productive ecology of the ocean, an ecology still recovering from past logging and pulp mill practices;</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2299	562 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>- Howe Sound is a beautiful place, wild, remote, a recreational and tourist mecca, only 30-60 minutes away from most of populous Metro Vancouver;</p> <p>- Howe Sound epitomises our "Beautiful British Columbia" national pride of place;</p> <p>- Howe Sound is recovering from the damage caused to its ecology by previous industrialization activities, a recovery made possible by an infusion of taxpayer's dollars as well as dedicated hours of volunteer effort;</p> <p>- The McNabb Creek provides rich stream waters to fertilize the productive ecology of the ocean, an ecology still recovering from past logging and pulp mill practices;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2300	562 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>-Environmental concerns include but are not limited to: * damages to and loss of the gains already achieved with regard to environmental rehabilitation of Howe Sound;</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2301	562 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>* damage to the well-being of salmon, herring, whales, dolphins and other marine life;</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2302	562 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* disruption of the habitats of animal and bird wildlife;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2303	562 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* disruption of the established flow of McNabb Creek; * inevitable damages to air and water quality;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2304	562 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* inevitable damages to air and water quality;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2305	562 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damages to water and soil quality due to leachate from acid rock;	<p>Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.</p> <p>Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material's potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.</p> <p>The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.</p>
2306	562 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damages due to noise, dust, light, and increased marine and other traffic;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2307	562 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damages due to noise, dust, light, and increased marine and other traffic;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2308	562 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damages due to noise, dust, light, and increased marine and other traffic;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2309	562 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damages due to noise, dust, light, and increased marine and other traffic;	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2310	562 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damage to the peace & quiet quality of life of the immediate and nearby residential areas;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2311	562 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* damage to the pristine and majestic beauty of Howe Sound and environs, so valuable both intrinsically and extrinsically to tourism and the tourist industry;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2312	562 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	- Economic concerns and considerations relate to: * negative impacts on tourism and recreational uses; * negative effects on fishing;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2313	562 - 20	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* negative effects on the rare marine sponge biotherm;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2314	562 - 21	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* negative effects on the health and well-being of residents of McNabb Creek and other Howe Sound communities;	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2315	562 - 22	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	*negative effects on the economies of other existing gravel pits;	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2316	562 - 23	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* negative effects on local and other Howe Sound property values;	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussions are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2317	562 - 24	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* McNabb Creek is not an Industrial Zone area, but is currently a Rural Zone Area;	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2318	562 - 25	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* The loss of the future economic advantage of a forest that is in a state of regeneration;	<p>The loss of wildlife habitat was described using wildlife habitat suitability index models and habitat associations as described in Section 5.3.1.5 of Volume 2, Section 5.3. A detailed vegetation assessment and discussion on proposed Project effects to vegetation is described in Section 5.3.2, Volume 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>The terrestrial LSA is 569 ha in size and does not contain any old growth forest. Approximately 20.0% (113.8 ha) of the Terrestrial LSA is considered mature forest, occurring mainly on the east side of McNab Creek, and as elevation increases from the valley bottom on either side of the LSA. These areas could be considered merchantable timber. Merchantable timber will be salvaged on site.</p> <p>The trees and vegetation where the pit lake is planned will be permanently lost (28.2 ha). However, reclamation activities post-closure will re-establish mature forest on site. Roosevelt elk winter habitat will be restored through the creation of 24.3 ha of mature forest over approximately 25 years. In addition, a total of 31 ha of moderate to high suitability Roosevelt elk habitat (based on habitat suitability index modelling) to the north, east and south of the Project area will be protected and left unaffected by the Project. Establishing mature forest will also provide suitable habitat for other mature forest species such as northern goshawk and marbled murrelet. Therefore, the removal of trees to establish the pit lake will be compensated for.</p>
2319	562 - 26	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* There appears to be conflicting information pertaining to the construction period, the estimated supply of aggregate, and the longevity of the project;	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.
2320	562 - 27	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* There appears to be conflicting information pertaining to the construction period, the estimated supply of aggregate, and the longevity of the project;	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2321	562 - 28	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* There is a concern that claims of increased jobs are not valid, in that a redistribution of labour among the suppliers of gravel will minimise any new expansion of labour requirements;	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers presented at the Public Open Houses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2322	562 - 29	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	* There is concern that taxpayers, not Burnco, will shoulder the ultimate burdens of site cleanup and restoration;	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2323	562 - 30	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	- Alternatives: * A proposal for the designation of Howe Sound as a UNESCO Biosphere Region offers an attractive, long term and sustainable option requiring serious consideration.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2324	563 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe sound is still on recovery from the Britannia mine, woodfibre past and in threat from woodfibre LNG.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2325	563 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Wildlife is returning and increasing howe sounds value as an eco-tourism destination. Eco-tourism is a low-impact low carbon emission industry that is being threatened by carbon intense development and pollution. Whale tours, guided eco-tours watersports are current growing employers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2326	563 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Wildlife is returning and increasing howe sounds value as an eco-tourism destination. Eco-tourism is a low-impact low carbon emission industry that is being threatened by carbon intense development and pollution. Whale tours, guided eco-tours watersports are current growing employers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2327	563 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Wildlife is returning and increasing howe sounds value as an eco-tourism destination. Eco-tourism is a low-impact low carbon emission industry that is being threatened by carbon intense development and pollution. Whale tours, guided eco-tours watersports are current growing employers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2328	564 - 1	Alison Scully	McNab Creek, BC	I don't understand how digging up an estuary to get at the material that provides natural filters for the very life in the estuary can ever be considered.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2329	564 - 2	Alison Scully	McNab Creek, BC	I am concerned about how the wildlife will get to the grasses and shoreline once their routes are blocked? From the model presented at the public meeting, the corridor that is left at the end of the project is very narrow. During the project, access will be cut off with a fence.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2330	564 - 3	Alison Scully	McNab Creek, BC	Peace and quiet are of the highest value to the residents of McNab Creek. Contrary to Burnco's statements, we are not seasonal visitors. We are there year round, every chance we get, and some residents are spending the majority of their retirement there. In their report, Burnco has used the fact that there is an occasional logging truck and dumping of logs into the ocean as the same as machinery constantly dredging and crushing. They've used terms like 'negligible' and 'not significant' when it comes to the noise they will generate. This is just not true and the noise will greatly affect our community.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2331	564 - 4	Alison Scully	McNab Creek, BC	I'm also concerned about the dead lake they are leaving behind. The model they showed was about as un-natural as it gets. The perfectly straight shore lines were so unattractive and completely at odds with the natural beauty of the area. What happens if there is leakage from the lake into McNab Creek due to the significant rainstorms we receive, or rising tides due to climate change? It's been noted that the lake will not support any life, so leakage won't be acceptable for the environment.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2332	564 - 5	Alison Scully	McNab Creek, BC	In the application is states the work hours are up to 14 hours per day and they will commit to the SCRD's noise bylaw 7am to 9pm. Working during 'daylight hours' was also a term used (quite a long time during summer - high use months). The operations manager said they are basing operations on 4, 10-hour shifts per week. There is clearly some inconsistency here.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2333	565 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I wish to voice my concerns regarding the proposed gravel extraction project by Burnco at the McNab Creek area. My concerns are as follows the claim by Burnco representatives that this project is sustainable, the impact that this project could have on the tourist industry in the Howe Sound area, the effects that this project could have on the newly recovered marine life of the sound and the impact of this project on the people who live in the Howe Sound region.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2334	565 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	At a meeting I attended a Burnco representative claimed that this project would be sustainable. I question how such a project could be sustainable when there is only a finite amount of gravel at this site so how can the extraction be sustainable. Once there is a hole in the ground what will replace the hole?	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2335	565 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	At a meeting I attended a Burnco representative claimed that this project would be sustainable. I question how such a project could be sustainable when there is only a finite amount of gravel at this site so how can the extraction be sustainable. Once there is a hole in the ground what will replace the hole?	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2336	565 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The Howe Sound area relies heavily on the tourist industry bringing in millions of dollars annually to this area. I see the scars from this project being detrimental to the tourist industry. People do not want to see scarred areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2337	565 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The Howe Sound area relies heavily on the tourist industry bringing in millions of dollars annually to this area. I see the scars from this project being detrimental to the tourist industry. People do not want to see scarred areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2338	565 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I am also concerned about the impact this project would have on the marine life in the Sound due the noise and the vibrations that would be generated by this project. The marine life in the Sound is only now recovering and the ocean is coming back to health after millions of dollars have been spent on clean up. Why throw all this improvement away?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2339	565 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2340	565 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2341	565 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2342	565 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2343	565 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound is a beautiful place that should be protected from industrial development, not a place where some company like Burnco can come for a short period of time and take away part of the Sound leaving the scars behind for a minimum number of people who may not be hired locally for the duration of the project. The approval of this project could be the thin edge of the wedge for more industrial development on the shores of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2344	565 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The location for this mine was according to a representative of Burnco was chosen over other alternative sites because they believed there would be less opposition from local people. This seems to me to be sheer arrogance and total disregard for a nation treasure driven by greed on the part of Burnco.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
2345	566 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I would like to add my voice to those that would like to see Howe Sound continue on it's path to recovery. Like many others I live on the Sea to Sky Corridor. Like many others too I have cancer. Fortunately I am in now in remission. Currently I am relatively healthy and very happy spending time doing what I love - being outdoors on the water, on the shore or in the mountains above the Sound. Every day I am so grateful to be alive. To live in such a wonderful place and be so connected to nature and the land. I draw strength from our place of land, sea and sky. On my trips to and from the Cancer Agency and hospital I drink in Howe Sound. It fills me up and settles me.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2346	566 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I take delight in the whale sightings, the news of the recovering Elk population, the annual migration of both sea and songbirds.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2347	566 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I take delight in the whale sightings, the news of the recovering Elk population, the annual migration of both sea and songbirds.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2348	566 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The Burnco Gravel mine is one more industry that will irrevocably alter Howe Sound and undo much good that has taken place in recent years. Twelve full time jobs are not worth the effect it will have on the McNabb estuary. It is with great sadness I have seen the redwing blackbird nesting grounds at Nexen Beach be bulldozed under for the new oceanfront development. To hear their song at twilight was absolutely magical. Now no more.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2349	566 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I know that 12 jobs would be created by the mine. This is small number of jobs. Surely we have the potential of creating far more jobs in the tourism and recreation sectors if we keep Howe Sound as a jewel to showcase to the rest of the world. A world thirsting for the natural world. It is a place of healing. A sanctuary. Let's strive to keep it so.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2350	566 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I know that 12 jobs would be created by the mine. This is small number of jobs. Surely we have the potential of creating far more jobs in the tourism and recreation sectors if we keep Howe Sound as a jewel to showcase to the rest of the world. A world thirsting for the natural world. It is a place of healing. A sanctuary. Let's strive to keep it so.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2351	567 - 1	David Bonner	East Vancouver, BC	Please do not approve the application for the Burnco Aggregate Project proposed for McNab Creek. Mining in McNab Creek would destroy the estuary and decimate the natural beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2352	567 - 2	David Bonner	East Vancouver, BC	This project would also have severely detrimental effect on fish habitat in the McNab estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2353	567 - 3	David Bonner	East Vancouver, BC	Destruction of wildlife habitat and the environment of Howe Sound for the dubious benefit of mining gravel makes no long-term sense, therefore I implore you to not to approve this project, now or in the future. Thank you for your attention.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2354	567 - 4	David Bonner	East Vancouver, BC	Destruction of wildlife habitat and the environment of Howe Sound for the dubious benefit of mining gravel makes no long-term sense, therefore I implore you to not to approve this project, now or in the future. Thank you for your attention.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2355	568 - 1	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>Page 4-33 states: that "no announcement from MFLNRO has yet been made with respect to the cumulative effects framework implementation in Howe Sound". This is not an accurate statement. In 2015 staff from MLFNRO announced CEF was moving forward and made this presentation to the Howe Sound Community Forum. Documentation exists to confirm this announcement and would be verified by FLNRO staff. Golder's assumptions in many instances throughout this document are not current or well researched which generates a level of distrust about the integrity of this assessment.</p>	<p>Page 4-33 of the EAC Application/EIS states: "MFLNRO is currently working on cumulative effects framework to help manage compounding changes to the environment. The cumulative effects framework is being actively applied in the Northeast, and MFLNRO plans to expand the framework to Howe Sound (MLFNRO 2015). Under this framework, Howe Sound will be considered as one region when impacts of major projects are assessed (Squamish Chief 2015). No announcement from MFLNRO has yet been made with respect to the cumulative effects framework implementation in Howe Sound."</p> <p>This remains the case. In the absence of a CEA Framework for Howe Sound, CEA Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in initiatives related to the monitoring, assessment, or management of cumulative environmental effects if requested by federal, provincial or regional government agencies.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2356	568 - 2	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Figures 4-4-6 should be compared to 2016 Google Earth images of the areas west of Port Mellon's Howe Sound Pulp and Paper. Log booming storage and processing activity is different in each of the maps and does not appear to be an accurate reflection of the current activity west of Port Mellon. This is relevant for setting the context of this project within Howe Sound. The list of projects considered in the Cumulative Assessment on pages 4-36-43 are missing the log sorting and processing operations taking place at the Hillside Industrial Park and Twin Creeks which can clearly be seen on Google Earth.</p> <p>To-date human activity has impacted most creeks and estuaries in Howe Sound. Along the Sunshine Coast – West Howe Sound area, active forestry operations at the base of McNair Creek and the Rainy River continue to impact the health of these rivers and estuaries and the ocean around the area. At the mouth of the McNab valley, logging activity is limited to the west end of the estuary and is minimal compared to the areas closer to Port Mellon that are large booming and processing operations where log booms and debris cover large areas of the water.</p>	Existing log dump and storage areas were considered in the CEA. There is no potetnial interaction between the these activities west of Port Mellon and potential residual effects of the proposed Project (i.e, after mitigation).

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2357	568 - 3	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	The addition of gravel mining and its related processing and barging activities would add new resource activity to Howe Sound and permanently alter the natural flow of surface and groundwater that flows into the estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure.</p> <p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2358	568 - 4	Ruth Simons	Howe Sound, BC	Alteration to this one remaining estuary is significant and should be protected. The environmental assessment should take into account the value of natural intact wetlands such as the McNab estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2359	569 - 1	Mark Smith	West Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my vehement opposition to the construction of the gravel pitt at McNabb Creek. This is the jewel of Howe Sound and it would not only destroy the serene beauty of the area, but would have a significantly detrimental impact on the wild and marine life, which could reach well beyond to other surrounding lands and waters.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2360	569 - 2	Mark Smith	West Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my vehement opposition to the construction of the gravel pitt at McNabb Creek. This is the jewel of Howe Sound and it would not only destroy the serene beauty of the area, but would have a significantly detrimental impact on the wild and marine life, which could reach well beyond to other surrounding lands and waters.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2361	569 - 3	Mark Smith	West Vancouver, BC	I'm writing to voice my vehement opposition to the construction of the gravel pitt at McNabb Creek. This is the jewel of Howe Sound and it would not only destroy the serene beauty of the area, but would have a significantly detrimental impact on the wild and marine life, which could reach well beyond to other surrounding lands and waters.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
2362	569 - 4	Mark Smith	West Vancouver, BC	Our environment needs to be sustainable for future generations; therefore, I urge you to reconsider this poor decision.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2363	570 - 1	Dr. Chris Overall	Vancouver, BC	I live in Vancouver, never see the creek but know it from once or twice flying over or boating.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2364	570 - 2	Dr. Chris Overall	Vancouver, BC	It is a crime to destroy a beautiful habitat for wildlife for so few jobs. Not impressed by long project but I get it...thats a lot of jobs and income, but this not..., Just USA economic interest.  My wife and I oppose this.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
2365	570 - 3	Dr. Chris Overall	Vancouver, BC	It is a crime to destroy a beautiful habitat for wildlife for so few jobs. Not impressed by long project but I get it...thats a lot of jobs and income, but this not..., Just USA economic interest.  My wife and I oppose this.	BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.  BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.  BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.
2366	571 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I really hope this project doesn't go ahead. It will ruin such a beautiful natural habitat and Howe Sound is just beginning to recover from years of abuse.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2367	572 - 1	Pamela Proctor	Gibsons, BC	Very important to the boating community, Howe Sound is a relatively compact area, which we are working hard to sustain and maintain.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2368	572 - 2	Pamela Proctor	Gibsons, BC	It is relatively 'clean' now and we need to keep the industrialization out in order to keep it that way. Howe Sound is a precious part of our coast, not to be tampered with.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2369	573 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	I am writing to express my opposition to the Burnco gravel extraction plan proposed for McNab Creek in Howe Sound. The residents of Howe Sound rely on the maintenance of a thriving tourist industry for their livelihoods and the sustainability of their communities. The proposed gravel mine would severely impact the natural scenic beauty of the area and would have, therefore, a consequent negative effect on the area's major industry. The proposed mine and its activities would, therefore, negatively impact the quality of life of Howe Sound residents.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2370	573 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The proposed mine site is situated on the western shore of Howe Sound directly opposite the Sea to Sky Highway, which runs along the eastern shore of the Sound. The Sea to Sky Highway is the only direct land route to Whistler from Vancouver airport and is a direct route from United States/British Columbia border crossings. Hundred of thousands of tourists drive along the Sea to Sky Highway every year on their way to Whistler. This route directly supports and contributes to over one billion dollars per year in tourism income generated by Whistler and the greater Howe Sound area.</p> <p>Given the proposed placement of the Burnco mine, all users of the Sea to Sky Highway—local residents and tourists will see the mine as they drive along the highway.</p> <p>The route of the Sea to Sky Highway was chosen by the province in order to take advantage of the spectacular scenic beauty of Howe Sound.</p> <p>The Sea to Sky Highway is, itself, a major tourist attraction in its own right. The highway supports many small businesses along the Howe Sound corridor. For example, several companies rent out high-end cars to those wishing to experience the unique drive to Whistler—a drive rated as one of the top ten best drives in the world.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2371	573 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>It makes no economic sense to allow a gravel mine operation to scar an environment which generates billions of dollars in tourist revenue each year. The proposed mine would bring in almost zero benefits to the micro economies of the region, and it would put the province in the position of potentially losing millions of dollars to a vital tourist industry which would then produce a knock-on negative effect to local, provincial and federal economies.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2372	573 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>I can see no benefit to anyone if this project is allowed to go ahead other than to the balance sheet of a small out of province-based mining company. In my view, the proposal is an example of environmental vandalism driven by corporate greed to the detriment of the local environment and population.</p>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2373	573 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	To claim, as Burnco is attempting to do, that the McNab Creek mine would be 'sustainable' is, in my view, ludicrous. How can a gravel mine be described as 'sustainable'? Gravel is a finite resource. If allowed to go ahead, Burnco's mining operations would last until the resource was exhausted. Once Burnco has extracted both its gravel and its profits, the residents of Howe Sound—human, animal, and vegetable will have to deal with the consequences of the company's actions—potentially for decades ahead.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2374	573 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	To claim, as Burnco is attempting to do, that the McNab Creek mine would be 'sustainable' is, in my view, ludicrous. How can a gravel mine be described as 'sustainable'? Gravel is a finite resource. If allowed to go ahead, Burnco's mining operations would last until the resource was exhausted. Once Burnco has extracted both its gravel and its profits, the residents of Howe Sound—human, animal, and vegetable will have to deal with the consequences of the company's actions—potentially for decades ahead.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2375	573 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Those tasked with making the decision about whether or not to allow the McNab gravel pit to go ahead should be aware of the recent history of Howe Sound—specifically, the environmental damage caused by the copper mine at Britannia Beach. It has taken over a decade to revive the waters of Howe Sound and, to the present, \$46 million dollars to clean up its waters so that it once again can support the mammal and fish species we now see in the Sound. Why put this environmental revival at risk for the profit of so few and the detriment to so many?</p> <p>Decision-makers should also be aware that Howe Sound is an area of spectacular natural beauty—an area just outside the bounds of Greater Vancouver and, therefore, easily accessible to millions. Why desecrate this beauty and the joy it gives to both local residents and visitors for the profit of a very few individuals?</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2376	573 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The vibrancy and diversity of the aquatic life in Howe Sound is well-documented. It is either a permanent home or an important feeding ground for whales, dolphins, and seals as well as herring and salmon among many other sea creatures.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2377	573 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The seabed below Howe Sound is home to glass sponges.	<p>Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2378	573 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The banks of McNab Creek are frequented by bear and elk among many other mammals. If the proposed gravel pit goes ahead, it will undoubtedly effect all these species as well as countless others.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2379	573 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	As important as protecting the natural beauty and sustainability of the creatures of Howe Sound is, it should not be forgotten that the Sound is home to thousands of human residents. Any industrial activity along the shores of the Sound is bound to directly effect the lives and sustainability of its communities.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2380	573 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Speaking at an 'information session' for the company's first proposed development plan, a Burnco spokesperson said that the major reason Burnco chose Howe Sound for its expansion was because it contained the smallest population of any of the sites under consideration. Burnco reasoned that, because of the relatively low population of the area, the McNab site would generate less opposition from local residents than would be the case if they chose another site. This argument fails to take into account local conditions and the symbiotic relationship between the population, environment and economic viability of the Howe Sound region.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2381	573 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>As a resident of Lions Bay, I point out that every single member of this community, (as well as every member of every other community in the Howe Sound region) will be negatively effected should Burnco's gravel extraction plant be approved. I do not think it is an overstatement to say that the existence of Lions Bay, as it is at present, is threatened if any industrial development in Howe Sound takes place.</p> <p>Communities along Howe Sound are not all bastions of wealth as is commonly thought. They are struggling isolated communities with small tax bases and, because of their mountainous locations, huge infrastructure and maintenance bills. For example, the village of Lions Bay is not self-sustainable. With a population of only 1,318, Lions Bay can raise only a small portion of the monies it needs to maintain a safe infrastructure up to required standards. As such, it relies on government grants to finance even its most basic needs such as a clean sustainable water supply, sewage management and urgent road and bridge repairs.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2382	573 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2383	573 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2384	573 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.
2385	573 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	In addition to the deterioration in their quality of life caused by the above effects, Lions Bay residents would also face financial disadvantage due to lowered house prices as a result of visual and noise pollution. Lions Bay has already suffered negative impacts due to the location of Highway 99, which runs through the heart of the village. Average house prices in Lions Bay are already significantly lower than in almost every other municipality and district on the North Shore. If even less potential house buyers view Lions Bay (and other effected communities) as a desirable place to buy a house, the tax base will shrink even further, more houses will be left vacant and Lions Bay may become nothing more than an unsustainable ghost town. Given the realities facing the community, the village of Lions Bay stands to lose the most of any constituency and will gain nothing by a Burnco development. In short, any industrialization on the McNab Creek site will erode the viability of Lions Bay as a sustainable community.	Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).  BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2386	573 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>In the larger picture, granting Burnco's application for the McNab Creek mine makes no economic sense. It will put the province in the position of potentially losing millions of dollars to a vital tourist industry. It will effect local, provincial and federal economies all in the name of supporting corporate greed. Burnco has stated that the gravel mine will support twelve jobs. There is no guarantee that these jobs will be filled locally, as far as I am aware. However, twelve jobs is a very, very expensive price to pay for the loss of environmental habit, species diversity, quality of life for thousands of people not to mention the jeopardy such development will place on billions of dollars of income from tourism. It is, in my view, senseless, for such a project to go ahead given its costs.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2387	573 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>I submit that no industrial development be permitted in Howe Sound—an area worthy of provincial, federal and international heritage site protection. Instead, I submit that the entire Howe Sound region should be comprehensively studied with the aim of maintaining and protecting this wonderful resource for the people of Canada.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2388	573 - 20	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>If shortsightedness prevails and this act of environmental vandalism is approved, I submit that Burnco should be required to provide quantifiable data to show that its development and operational activities of its McNab site will have no negative effects, such as vibrations, noise or lights, on all co-habiting creatures including those in surrounding communities.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2389	573 - 21	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>If shortsightedness prevails and this act of environmental vandalism is approved, I submit that Burnco should be required to provide quantifiable data to show that its development and operational activities of its McNab site will have no negative effects, such as vibrations, noise or lights, on all co-habiting creatures including those in surrounding communities.</p>	<p>BURNCO will develop a project-specific website that will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed regarding the Project, including project schedule, construction activities, operating information, and noise and air quality monitoring data.</p>
2390	574 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>I am writing to raise several concerns regarding the potential impact of the planned Burnco gravel mine at the McNab Creek site in Howe Sound.</p> <p>While I lack the expertise to speak to the impacts of this project to the flora and fauna of Howe Sound, the impacts of this project to the human environment of the Sound will be severe and prolonged, if not permanent.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2391	574 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is extensively used for recreational purposes, such as boating, and hiking on an extensive trail network on the eastern edge of the sound, much of which has line-of-sight to the location of the planned mine. The eastern edge of the sound and the islands in the sound are also home to a small but non-trivial population, most of whom live in this area out of a desire for peace and quiet away from most human activity, including industry. The Burnco development is likely to severely impact both categories of people who visit or live in the Howe Sound region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2392	574 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Recreational use will be impacted by the visual pollution created by the mine. Howe Sound is known for its vistas and those vistas will be negatively impacted by the addition of a mine on the scale of the Burnco project. I have seen no data or estimates on the extent recreational use of the Sound will be impacted by the Burnco project but such data ought to be collected and all necessary steps ought to be taken to ensure that recreational use is not disturbed or reduced by the mine. 'All necessary steps,' in my view, may include denying permission for the mine to be built if the impact on recreational use will be too great.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2393	574 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The impact on residents will likely be more extensive. The largest community in Howe Sound, Lions Bay, has a direct line of sight to the mine location. The value of Howe Sound properties is highly dependent on views of the natural landscape and will likely be adversely impacted by the destruction of the natural landscape at the mine site. This is even more of a concern in light of the progressive clearcutting of the western shore of the Sound. It may well be the case that the Burnco project constitutes the thin end of the wedge where the views of the landscape in the Sound become perceived not—as they are now—as being overwhelmingly natural, but marred by the occasional clearcut, but rather as being industrial and only blessed with the occasional remains of a natural landscape. Such a change in perception, should it occur, will have negative impacts on property values because it will render the environment of the sound less desirable for human habitation. All necessary steps ought to be taken to minimize such impacts on existing property holders.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2394	574 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	The most severe impact to existing residents, however, may well be due to noise and vibration from rock crushers and other industrial equipment at the Burnco site. Regional experience from the construction project to upgrade Highway 99 in preparation for the 2010 Olympics is that noise and vibration from rock crushers are disruptively perceptible at distances measured in the tens of kilometres. The prospects of noise pollution from the Burnco project do not appear to have been adequately addressed.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2395	574 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	Ongoing noise, and especially vibration, for the duration of the Burnco project would be extremely disruptive to the peacefully quiet environment currently enjoyed by Howe Sound residents. All possible steps ought to be taken to ensure that vibration does not reach even the houses nearest to the mine site under any circumstances and that noise not be audible outside of extremely rare atmospheric conditions.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2396	574 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>To be frank, I do not believe the Burnco mine project should proceed. The location is far better suited to remain as-is so that the natural beauty of the Howe Sound region can be enjoyed by future generations instead of permanently damaged by an inherently unsustainable non-renewable resource extraction project. However, if the project must proceed, I believe the following conditions ought to be imposed:</p> <p>* Unused areas of the mine pits should be filled in and replanted immediately upon disuse in order to minimize the visual footprint of the mine. Consideration ought to be given to covering as much of the site as is practicable with camouflage netting to further reduce the visual footprint of the mine.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2397	574 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>* Monitoring and mitigation measures should be implemented to ensure vibration and noise from mine equipment, such as site generator(s) and rock crusher(s), are not perceptible by area residents.</p>	<p>Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.</p>
2398	574 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is perceived as a natural gem thanks to its quiet natural vistas. This perception and the reality on which it is based is not compatible with large scale industrial development, such as the Burnco project. When taken in the context of continuing clearcutting of the western side of the Sound and the prospect for further re-industrialization at the Woodfibre site, I believe the Burnco project is a step too far that will ruin the character of the sound not just for the 16 years the site is intended to operate but potentially permanently. The mine does not belong here.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2399	575 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>I am writing to voice my concern over the proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek in Howe Sound. Approval of that mine would amount to short term thinking.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2400	575 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	<p>Such a mine will destroy McNab Creek as a salmon spawning bed, one more blow to the salmon fishery on the west coast.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2401	575 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Vancouver, BC	A gravel mine would last a short time and then would be gone; the workers there would join the unemployed. Salmon fisheries on the other hand, if well managed, have the potential to provide employment, food for people, and vital support for wild life and the ecology in perpetuity. I urge you to take a long term view, and to choose salmon and the ecology over a short term gravel mine.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2402	576 - 1	Janice Eckert	North Vancouver, BC	This proposed project scares the hell out of me. It should scare everyone. Have never visited Howe Sound and seen its pristine beauty.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2403	577 - 1	Spider Robinson	Vancouver, BC	<p>Here is a comment I just posted at &lt;<a href="http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/burnco_form.html#sthash.TKFmUaNN.dpuf">www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/burnco_form.html#sthash.TKFmUaNN.dpuf</a>&gt;:</p> <p>I strongly protest Burnco's proposed destruction of the McNab Estuary, and its conversion from a precious environmental treasure, to an active mining operation in a rural residential region. I have lived near active mines, and I would not wish that on you or anyone in government, unless Tronald Dump wins. Please return the favor. We on Bowen Island remember things like this for a LONG time.</p> <p>I also said they could quote me. So can you.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2404	578 - 1	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Similar to letters sent to the BCEAO a few years ago, we will continue to question the need for another large scale industrial mine within one of the magical areas of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2405	578 - 2	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>This is a place where silence and beauty is so spectacular that you can read a book while hearing only the occasional splash of a seal, the flapping of wings from a blue heron, and the crunching teeth of a sea otter while eating his morning fish. Mountains tower straight out of the ocean 3,000 - 5,000 feet in a 360 degree view. Kids paddle board in notoriously calm waters. There is recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife. You may think you are in Alaska but you are only 45 minutes from downtown Vancouver.</p> <p>It seems so long ago that the Howe Sound was so polluted that no one was even interested in enjoying the many wonders of this area. This is not the only area that has had a eye opener. Consider, the dump within the Whistler town center 40 years ago before it was really discovered. The logging dumps in Tofino and clear cutting in Clayoquot Sound, prior to it becoming a UNESCO biosphere or the recent success of the Sea to Sky Gondola in a town that has emerged from a rough industrial history. Even the shores of Vancouver were once filled with heavy industry and is now one of the most livable metropolitan areas in Canada. The beauty of McNab Valley is that it is not overcome by tourists, it is actually slightly hard to get to without a boat. However, there are many areas in BC (such as the ones above) that were also once hard to get to. Access to Howe Sounds is slowly changing with the growth in water taxi's more and more personal water craft, kayaks and paddle boards etc. Please be cognizant of the monetary value in increased marine resources and potential tourism dollars that will greatly</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2406	578 - 3	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The immense benefits that this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems is truly spectacular. The industrial applications that are being considered for this region are truly disappointing. I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2407	578 - 4	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	The immense benefits that this area offers with respect to both natural marine and terrestrial ecosystems is truly spectacular. The industrial applications that are being considered for this region are truly disappointing. I understand that gravel is an important part of our lives but a mine of this nature would surely be better suited in other locations with a lower impact to both the ecosystem and tourism economy.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2408	578 - 5	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>More Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place and no repercussions should the noise be disturbing.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2409	578 - 6	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>More Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from rock crushers reverberating off the mountains surrounding the site and the ocean. This area is valued for its peace and quiet and majestic beauty. Apparently, there is no plan to have any monitoring mechanism in place and no repercussions should the noise be disturbing.</li> </ul>	<p>Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2410	578 - 7	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the effects on marine life, wildlife, fish etc. be negative (which is very likely) there are no repercussions or any way of turning this project around once it has been approved.</li> </ul>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2411	578 - 8	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco and Golder have a huge amount irrelevant references and personal communications cited within the EAC Application/EIS. They are clearly trying to overwhelm the concerned parties with information that no one has time to actually qualify.</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2412	578 - 9	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2413	578 - 10	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco tries to play-down all the effects on the biodiversity and ecological value of the estuary and recovering Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2414	578 - 11	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco is pushing hard to influence Sunshine Coast regional District to rezoning the property from current rural to industrial use. We don't need more industry in Howe Sound.</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2415	578 - 12	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should there be an extreme flood (which will eventually happen) the increased volume of the creek will likely break through berms and the proposed new "lake". Once again no measures in place to rectify such a disaster.</li> </ul>	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
2416	578 - 13	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No benefit to the local community, no appreciation for Howe Sounds beauty, and no measure for social license.</li> <li>Sound unique biosphere and beauty, only loss of a spectacular valley just 30 minutes from Horseshoe Bay.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2417	578 - 14	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been and would continue to be a decline in property values and natural capital values within the region.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2418	578 - 15	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be many long term effects of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine (and only 12 permanent jobs created for Burnco).</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2419	578 - 16	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impacts on wildlife from the new Run of the River project and ongoing logging in the McNab Valley has not been accounted for.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2420	578 - 17	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once approved it is very likely that they will apply for enhanced future expansion plans of the mine beyond 16 years (could double) and its current size (could double).</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
2421	578 - 18	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BURNCO has donated more than \$200,000 to Liberals and NDP in BC</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2422	578 - 19	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>I know that I am not alone with these concerns. There are many professional groups that all agree that a mine of this nature is a bad idea. Below is a snapshot of who else is opposed to this new industrialization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Suzuki Foundation</li> <li>• Environmental consulting firms</li> <li>• GeoTech firms</li> <li>• Marine biologists</li> <li>• BC Stream Keepers</li> <li>• Squamish First Nations</li> <li>• Tourism operators</li> <li>• Yacht Clubs and out-stations</li> <li>• Local municipalities and residents</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries</li> <li>• Local kids camps</li> <li>• Local recreation seekers</li> <li>• Local property owners</li> <li>• International tourists</li> </ul> <p>The ecological value of this area is so unique that there have also been applications and proposals for large parts of the Howe Sounds to be designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere...or, ironically more industrial land!?</p> <p>I plead with you to think about the future of the Howe Sound and save it from becoming more industrialized.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2423	578 - 20	Steve Dietrich	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The ecological value of this area is so unique that there have also been applications and proposals for large parts of the Howe Sounds to be designated as a National Park and or a UNESCO Biosphere...or, ironically more industrial land!? I plead with you to think about the future of the Howe Sound and save it from becoming more industrialized. Thank you your time to consider.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2424	579 - 1	Sean McAllindon	Toronto, ON	I live in Toronto and for the last 16 years I have traveled (with Family) to enjoy the unrivalled beauty of your home province - B.C. One of our favorite places to visit – boat, kayak, fish and swim is Howe Sound.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2425	579 - 2	Sean McAllindon	Toronto, ON	We ask you not to take on the risks associated with the Burnco project. The minor economic merits for Burnco are certainly not worth the negative economic impact this will have on tourism and the environment.  The last thing we want to experience in the heart of this beautiful area is industrialization. Do the right thing and stop Burnco from building an open pit mine in the heart of one of our most cherished natural resource!	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2426	580 - 1	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	As a resident of Williamsons Landing and a member of the Twin Creeks OCP review committee, I would like to register my concerns over the Burnco Proposed Gravel Pit at McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2427	580 - 2	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	Although the proposed mining activities are planned for privately owned property, I feel the impact of the mining activities will extend well beyond the property boundaries. I think the noise and light pollution, along with the substantial loading facilities and pit, will impact the enjoyment and experience that boaters and campers currently have in this area. The negative impact on tourism will have a negative financial impact on the Sunshine Coast. In addition, wildlife in the area of the mine and in the Howe Sound will be negatively impacted.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2428	580 - 3	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	Although the proposed mining activities are planned for privately owned property, I feel the impact of the mining activities will extend well beyond the property boundaries. I think the noise and light pollution, along with the substantial loading facilities and pit, will impact the enjoyment and experience that boaters and campers currently have in this area. The negative impact on tourism will have a negative financial impact on the Sunshine Coast. In addition, wildlife in the area of the mine and in the Howe Sound will be negatively impacted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2429	580 - 4	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	Although the proposed mining activities are planned for privately owned property, I feel the impact of the mining activities will extend well beyond the property boundaries. I think the noise and light pollution, along with the substantial loading facilities and pit, will impact the enjoyment and experience that boaters and campers currently have in this area. The negative impact on tourism will have a negative financial impact on the Sunshine Coast. In addition, wildlife in the area of the mine and in the Howe Sound will be negatively impacted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2430	580 - 5	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	Although the proposed mining activities are planned for privately owned property, I feel the impact of the mining activities will extend well beyond the property boundaries. I think the noise and light pollution, along with the substantial loading facilities and pit, will impact the enjoyment and experience that boaters and campers currently have in this area. The negative impact on tourism will have a negative financial impact on the Sunshine Coast. In addition, wildlife in the area of the mine and in the Howe Sound will be negatively impacted.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2431	580 - 6	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>Although the proposed mining activities are planned for privately owned property, I feel the impact of the mining activities will extend well beyond the property boundaries. I think the noise and light pollution, along with the substantial loading facilities and pit, will impact the enjoyment and experience that boaters and campers currently have in this area. The negative impact on tourism will have a negative financial impact on the Sunshine Coast. In addition, wildlife in the area of the mine and in the Howe Sound will be negatively impacted.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2432	580 - 7	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>Clearly, at 20 million tons, this is a small gravel deposit with a low net value per ton that will generate little in the way of lasting benefits for the Sunshine Coast. The quantity of gravel that will be supplied to the Vancouver market will not be a major factor in gravel pricing. The lake that will remain at the end of the mine life will be on private land and unavailable for the public's enjoyment.</p> <p>I feel that the potential benefits to the Sunshine Coast of this proposed gravel pit do not warrant the the negative impact on the environment.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2433	580 - 8	Hugh Wilson	Williamsons Landing, BC	<p>Clearly, at 20 million tons, this is a small gravel deposit with a low net value per ton that will generate little in the way of lasting benefits for the Sunshine Coast. The quantity of gravel that will be supplied to the Vancouver market will not be a major factor in gravel pricing. The lake that will remain at the end of the mine life will be on private land and unavailable for the public's enjoyment.</p> <p>I feel that the potential benefits to the Sunshine Coast of this proposed gravel pit do not warrant the the negative impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2434	581 - 1	Bill Hamilton	Nanoose Bay, BC	<p>With a supply of 100 years readily available in the Fraser Valley from established sources, the need for this mine cannot be justified.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2435	581 - 2	Bill Hamilton	Nanoose Bay, BC	Additionally, the potential disruption to marine life and the negative impact on the boating community warrants its rejection.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2436	581 - 3	Bill Hamilton	Nanoose Bay, BC	Additionally, the potential disruption to marine life and the negative impact on the boating community warrants its rejection.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2437	582 - 1	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	It is my strong opinion that the Burnco aggregate removal project in Howe Sound is an unfortunate example of incredible poor land management. It is not in concert with the Sound communities and is a retrograde step environmentally.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2438	582 - 2	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2439	582 - 3	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2440	582 - 4	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2441	582 - 5	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	An aggregate mine has surely to be one of the worst activities to site in such an area. The proposed volume of aggregate removal will cumulatively impact this recovering environment through dust generation, removal of vegetation, aquatic, noise and visual disturbance, to name but a few.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2442	582 - 6	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	The latest Golder study, though extensive in some areas still contains considerable weakness in its assumptions and methodology.	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2443	582 - 7	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	We understand that Burnco claim that the Sound's use over the last one hundred years has been one of industrial activity. This is a shameful statement as we the public and you the government have over recent years made such tremendous strides in its reparation. It is now becoming once again a beautiful natural Lower Mainland asset that we can have pride in, and visitors can admire.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2444	582 - 8	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	We urge the government to deny approval to a project of this nature. It has little economic upside outside of Burnco's profitability and yet has so much impact and risk to this scenic and natural environment on our doorstep.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2445	582 - 9	Reg Allen	West Vancouver, BC	In summary a regional plan for the development of Howe Sound is crucial, it would enable criteria and guide lines for any proposed activities and avoid long expensive processes such as we are involved in at the moment.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2446	583 - 1	Lois Thompson	Gibsons, BC	As a resident of the sunshine coast, Gibsons, I am absolutely unequivocally against this proposed gravel mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2447	583 - 2	Lois Thompson	Gibsons, BC	We have just cleaned up how sound from many years of industrial waste. We finally have a jewel right next to the lower mainland. Please don't be so shortsighted.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2448	583 - 3	Lois Thompson	Gibsons, BC	Yes you need gravel but you really don't need to ruin the wetlands that actually are the nursery of the health of all water. Your water, whales water, ducks water, herring's water, my water.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
2449	583 - 4	Lois Thompson	Gibsons, BC	Yes you need gravel but you really don't need to ruin the wetlands that actually are the nursery of the health of all water. Your water, whales water, ducks water, herring's water, my water.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2450	584 - 1	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	The proposal from Burnco is not environmentally sustainable. The potential damage to tourism, water, wildlife (including the fishery) make this a project that should not be supported.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2451	584 - 2	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	The proposal from Burnco is not environmentally sustainable. The potential damage to tourism, water, wildlife (including the fishery) make this a project that should not be supported.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2452	584 - 3	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	The proposal from Burnco is not environmentally sustainable. The potential damage to tourism, water, wildlife (including the fishery) make this a project that should not be supported.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2453	584 - 4	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	The proposal from Burnco is not environmentally sustainable. The potential damage to tourism, water, wildlife (including the fishery) make this a project that should not be supported.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2454	584 - 5	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	The proposal from Burnco is not environmentally sustainable. The potential damage to tourism, water, wildlife (including the fishery) make this a project that should not be supported.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2455	584 - 6	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	As a member of Schooner Cove Yacht Club, located in Nanoose Bay, B.C. (north of Nanaimo on Vancouver Island) I look, from our home and our marina, across to the Sunshine Coast, specifically Sechelt, and see the awful slab of grey on the hillside which is a gravel pit on First Nations land that has been there for many years. We see it every time we go out in our boat. We see that nothing is growing there, though we do not see much work activity. The same is the case on Texada Island, located between Vancouver Island and the Mainland – the view from Powell River is awful and the environmental damage is staggering. What must all the tourists on cruise ships (aside from all the recreational boaters) think of Canada's/B.C.'s environmental policies?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2456	584 - 7	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	Please think in terms of development of smaller, staggered projects which are then reclaimed (made to look similar to the original landscape) before moving on to the next stage, i.e. Project #2. Do environmental homework on rivers, streams, potential landslides, loss of wildlife habitat, marine habitat, etc. versus the profit of a single corporation.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2457	584 - 8	Kathy Swangard	Nanoose Bay, BC	Please accept my vote AGAINST approval of this project, and against similar projects on an environmentally sensitive coastline – in B.C. Or anywhere in Canada.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2458	585 - 1	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	Howe Sound is only now finally recovering from decades of environmental abuse.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2459	585 - 2	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel mine at McNabb Creek would renew the policy of sacrificing irreplaceable habitat for very minimal economic gain -- and whatever that gain might be, it would be more than eliminated if the operators of the mine were to fail to restore the area to its natural state after the mining operation. If the company were to go out of business, the province and its taxpayers would be left holding the bag.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2460	585 - 3	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The proposed gravel mine at McNabb Creek would renew the policy of sacrificing irreplaceable habitat for very minimal economic gain -- and whatever that gain might be, it would be more than eliminated if the operators of the mine were to fail to restore the area to its natural state after the mining operation. If the company were to go out of business, the province and its taxpayers would be left holding the bag.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2461	585 - 4	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I strongly oppose the mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2462	585 - 5	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2463	585 - 6	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2464	585 - 7	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2465	585 - 8	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	I live just across the sound from its location and I would have to put up with its noise and light pollution in addition to the knowledge that it would be destroying elk, salmon and orca habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2466	585 - 9	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	The only beneficiaries of this project would be the owners of the Burnco Corporation, not the local communities, not the wildlife, and not the province.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2467	585 - 10	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	Unless Burnco is willing to put up a bond of tens of millions of dollars to guarantee the restoration of the habitat, this project should not even receive consideration.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2468	585 - 11	Jon Povill	Lions Bay, BC	And even if such a bond is offered, the disruption to the ecosystem, the noise and unsightliness of the site, along with the loss of value in tourism and filming location fees all speak to the undesirability of this project. Please do not grant it an approval.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2469	586 - 1	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	Boating issues in Howe Sound regarding the BURNCO Aggregate Project - The northern reaches of Howe Sound exist as a recreational jewel: seemingly remote and pristine, and yet a short day trip from many areas of the Lower Mainland. Boaters seek this area out for its off-the-grid peace and quiet. There are 5 yacht clubs with outstations in various locations in Howe Sound. It is an attractive destination for recreational boaters outside the lower mainland with marinas in Snug Cove on Bowen Island and in Gibsons and offers the same spectacular vistas as Desolation Sound or Princess Louisa Inlet. After many decades of toxic industrial mining pollution, Howe Sound has emerged as a safe and clean area. The return of industry, specifically the BURNCO Aggregate Project located in the McNab Valley at McNab Creek, threatens the recovery and the increasing recreational usage of this southern-most fjord.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2470	586 - 2	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys the peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces the attractiveness of this area. This project brings with it the risk that both local and visiting boaters may choose other areas to spend their recreational dollars in Gibsons and on Bowen Island.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2471	586 - 3	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	<p>The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys the peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces the attractiveness of this area. This project brings with it the risk that both local and visiting boaters may choose other areas to spend their recreational dollars in Gibsons and on Bowen Island.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2472	586 - 4	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys the peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces the attractiveness of this area. This project brings with it the risk that both local and visiting boaters may choose other areas to spend their recreational dollars in Gibsons and on Bowen Island.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2473	586 - 5	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	The economic gain belongs solely to Burnco, while it destroys the peace and enjoyment of this spectacular vista: a dust/smoke/lights-at-night eyesore that will be visible greatly reduces the attractiveness of this area. This project brings with it the risk that both local and visiting boaters may choose other areas to spend their recreational dollars in Gibsons and on Bowen Island.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2474	586 - 6	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	Noise reverberates off the mountains surrounding this site. Although the Burnco plan includes a berm, it remains uncertain that berms offer much mitigation to sound over water and at the bottom of the surrounding 'bowl' of mountains. Although Burnco's application indicates that noise would be as loud as a 'fridge running', it is precisely this type of white urban noise, and machine/industrial noise that boaters seek out this area for it's current peace and silence.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2475	586 - 7	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	The wakes of commercial vessels travelling to/from this site (water taxis, tug boats and barges) present risks to all recreational vessels including kayakers, paddle-boarders, swimmers, water-skiers. Safety in this recreational area, considering the many small vessel users could be compromised if swamped by the increased commercial traffic. On-the-water marine events such as sailing races, yacht club sail-pasts, children's camps conducting canoeing or kayaking trips are vulnerable to commercial traffic.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2476	586 - 8	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	Calgary-based Burnco Rock Products donated \$34,000 to the Liberals, bringing their eight year running total to \$219,700. Writes Dermot Travis, executive director of Integrity BC, 23 April 2014. This amount is considered by the author to be 'outlandish'. At this time \$286,700.00 has been donated by Burnco to the BC Liberal Government. We must question the intent of a company that already enjoys a lower tax rate (mining) imposed by the province donating this much money.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
2477	586 - 9	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	Many boaters use the foreshore area/estuary of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. This area is attractive as it is the only estuary in this area. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that reduces boater interest. The small anchorage immediately facing McNab Creek where boats can anchor will be destroyed as a tenable recreational anchoring area in the face of a large loading dock and water taxi/tug/barge traffic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2478	586 - 10	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	Many boaters use the foreshore area/estuary of McNabb Creek for recreation of fishing, prawning and crabbing. This area is attractive as it is the only estuary in this area. Not only will a mine and it's accompanying marine traffic greatly diminish the marine life populations that support fishing, the risk to small dingies/boats from the increased tug/barge and water taxi traffic exists as another consideration that reduces boater interest. The small anchorage immediately facing McNab Creek where boats can anchor will be destroyed as a tenable recreational anchoring area in the face of a large loading dock and water taxi/tug/barge traffic.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2479	586 - 11	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	BURNCO's Environmental Assessment application has not clearly identified the following points: • The construction phase (4 months – 2 years).	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.
2480	586 - 12	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	• The tonnage of gravel to be extracted: 1 million tonnes / year for 16 years or 20 million tonnes over the life of the project.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
2481	586 - 13	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	• The number of tugs/barges required to move the above tonnes of gravel.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2482	586 - 14	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	• The number of employees requiring water taxi transportation (the number of water taxis).	It is anticipated that during operations, the water taxi will make one return trip to/from the project site each day (520 trips per year).BURNCO will either provide its own water taxi or contract one from a local operator.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2483	586 - 15	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burnco's application mentions the development of a Marine Transportation Plan that is, in our many decades of experience as recreational boaters) unrealistic. Kayakers, children's camp canoes, paddle boaters, water-skiers and smaller boats cannot easily manoeuver in the face of high speed water taxis and tugs carrying empty barges. This plan offers local boaters some flexibility during marine on-the-water events, but this is unrealistic and lacks credibility in that this places the responsibility on individual or group users to inform Burnco of these events.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2484	586 - 16	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fraser Valley Regional District Aggregate Inventory Atlas identified (in 2009) that there are sufficient sources of aggregate within the lower mainland to meet demand for 100 years. Burnco incorrectly identifies a growing need for gravel that requires additional sources.</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2485	586 - 17	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	<p>Howe Sound has no land or resource management plan and yet the Squamish/Lillooet Regional District has a plan as does the Sunshine Coast possess a Sustainability Plan. It behooves the approval process to consider a project such as this within the context of a land and resource/marine management plan.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2486	586 - 18	Merrien Loughead	Not Stated	For the above reasons, we respectfully request that the Burnco Aggregate Project be rejected.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2487	587 - 1	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	My husband and I live in Lions Bay, which we think of as paradise. Living on the edge of Howe Sound is a privilege we do not take for granted.  We understand that business is business and that your company needs a product to sell. However, we cannot understand why you have chosen McNab Creek as a place to be dug out for gravel.	The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.  Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
2488	587 - 2	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	My husband and I live in Lions Bay, which we think of as paradise. Living on the edge of Howe Sound is a privilege we do not take for granted.  We understand that business is business and that your company needs a product to sell. However, we cannot understand why you have chosen McNab Creek as a place to be dug out for gravel.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
2489	587 - 3	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	It is hard to believe that your company will only run for 16 years and only a few hours a day after the effort and cost to create the gravel pit. It seems that this is what you intend to gain approval.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2490	587 - 4	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	It is hard to believe that your company will only run for 16 years and only a few hours a day after the effort and cost to create the gravel pit. It seems that this is what you intend to gain approval.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
2491	587 - 5	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	The noise pollution alone will be an offence to anyone living in this amazing area. Simply put, sound travels so easily along waterways. Add in low marine cloud or fogs and the grating racket will become even more horrific. It is a fact that gravel pits are noisy; digging up rock is not a quiet pasttime. Anyone living near any gravel industry in the world will say the same thing.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2492	587 - 6	Angela and Chris Atkins	Lions Bay, BC	Please reconsider another use for the land you purchased. Allowing it to become an area that can benefit post-secondary students or researchers studying geology, environment, biology, marine biology, etc. may be a terrific tax incentive for your company. Perhaps creating camps for children or adults could be another tax incentive option. That way you aren't totally losing out on your purchase of the property and we believe everybody living here would be supportive of those endeavours.	A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.  Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2493	588 - 1	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	We moved to Lions Bay 48 years ago when Howe Sound had been biologically dead as a result of being used as a dump site for the Britannia Mine and Woodfibre Pulp Mill. Both operations provided hundreds of jobs for workers, so it was considered an “acceptable trade off” for the loss of the environment and the fishing industry.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2494	588 - 2	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2495	588 - 3	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2496	588 - 4	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Both operations are now shut down for years and nature has re-juvenated itself. Many species of wildlife, including dolphins, salmon, herring as well as grizzlies have returned and were widely hailed by the News Media and have become attractions for the tourist industry.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2497	588 - 5	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	Is it now time to reverse the trend, by creating one or two dozens jobs at the expense of a much less invasive industry which supports hundreds of workers directly and indirectly?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2498	588 - 6	Hardy Goetsch	Lions Bay, BC	I suggest this is NOT the correct way to go, as there are other suitable, less invasive gravel locations where the damage will be less evident.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
2499	589 - 1	Tyler Smith	North Vancouver, BC	The Howe Sound has been on mend for forty years why mess it up now already has huge polluter in Port Mellon	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2500	590 - 1	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel deposits act like a huge sponge storing water in the spring and releasing it the hot dry summer months. This water is estential for the eco system of McNab creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2501	590 - 2	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel deposits act like a huge sponge storing water in the spring and releasing it the hot dry summer months. This water is estential for the eco system of McNab creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2502	590 - 3	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	Gravel mining can not be allowed to happen there.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2503	590 - 4	Ray Mason	Pemberton, BC	There are no mitigating actions that could replace the loss of the gravel.	<p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2504	591 - 1	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	My concern is for the Resident Sea Run Cutthroat Trout of Mcnab creek Estuary and Creek.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2505	591 - 2	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	Being an owner of Mcnab creek estates and a Father of two my son Colin who is now 29 has been brought up fishing this Estuary / Creek since he was 8 years old. As responsible Anglers in this area , having practiced Catch and Release fishing for this Fisheries for the past 20+ years .	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2506	591 - 3	Tom McConnell	Vancouver, BC	<p>I feel that the habitat report does not address this Fisheries adequately and extensive study needs to be done to study the species effects of ROCK DUST on the Ocean floor of the estuary the feeding grounds of this ENDANGERED. The Trout follow the fry out of the Creek and live in the Estuary until Late July / August at that time they follow the Salmon up the creek to feed. From April to August the Trout Habitat is all over the shallows of the Estuary / 3 spawning channels especially at the westerly channel around the The Rock were the proposed conveyor is projected to be.</p> <p>Thankyou for taking the time to read and address the concerns of such a sensitive Fisherie.</p>	<p>Coastal cutthroat trout inhabit a wide variety of diverse freshwater, estuarine and marine habitats. Cutthroat trout spawn in the late winter or early spring and their fry emerge in late spring or early summer after the salmon fry have emerged. After emerging cutthroat fry move down into slower pool and off-channel habitats unless they are displaced to shallower riffle habitat by larger and more aggressive coho fry. Cutthroat move into deeper pools in the fall for overwintering. The life histories and movements of coastal cutthroat trout populations are diverse between individual fish during rearing, overwintering, and spawning areas. Their life history strategies may include populations where most fish are anadromous but some individuals never go to sea, while others may utilize estuarine habitats on a seasonal basis and return to freshwater to overwinter. Multiple life-history forms often coexist within the same system and even within the same stream reach. This high level of individual flexibility allows coastal cutthroat trout to shift and exploit habitats that are seasonally utilized by other salmonids.</p> <p>The potential for rock dust being released and settling in aquatic habitat was considered during the assessment. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2507	592 - 1	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	We are writing this letter to express our strong opposition to the Alberta/Texas aggregate company BURNCO's application to construct and operate an open pit sand/ gravel mine and crushing facility proposed in the estuary on the productive fish/salmon bearing McNab Creek on the northwest shore of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
2508	592 - 2	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	As very long time residents of Howe Sound, we are extremely concerned about the severely adverse impact such a project will have on McNab Creek and the overall health of Howe Sound's marine ecosystem.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2509	592 - 3	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2510	592 - 4	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2511	592 - 5	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO indicates that the destruction of this sensitive fish habitat will be very profitable for it and create 12 full time jobs. But at what cost to the environment and sustainable economy of Howe Sound?	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2512	592 - 6	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	As you are aware, after decades of industrial abuse making Howe Sound North America's most toxic mining waste site, about \$45 million of our tax payers dollars were spent cleaning up the Sound. Living on the shores of Howe Sound for almost 30 years, we have been delighted to see this investment of our tax dollars pay off with recovering fish populations and the concomitant recovery of sea mammal populations. While almost never seen in the first 15 to 20 years here, now almost weekly for the past decade we see cetaceans feeding. For example, last week we saw two rare false killer whales heading up Howe Sound. And a few days later we saw a vast, dense school of anchovies swimming along the shoreline. The size of this school was astonishing -- stretching over 220 feet in length, 50 feet wide and two to three feet depth. It's these rebounding stocks that are sustaining Howe Sound's recovering humpbacks and a myriad of other species.	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2513	592 - 7	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	BURNCO's own consultants have identified 21 species that are on the Species at Risk list that will be negatively impacted by this proposed open pit gravel mine in McNab Estuary.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2514	592 - 8	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>In this age of rapid species disappearance and extinction across Canada and around our planet, can you imagine a more heartening and positive environmental story than the 'Great Howe Sound Recovery' and just 20 kilometers from Canada's the third largest city. For once, a positive story and in the backdoor 'play ground' to be enjoyed by Vancouver's 2.5 million people. Breath-taking!</p> <p>However, as we also witness daily, this recovery is still extremely fragile. Howe Sound remains largely unprotected and with no long term land use plan. Caught between many different political jurisdictions and impacted by rapidly rising ocean temperatures and acidification, the fragile ecosystem of Howe Sound remains at risk; with highly unusual and unprecedented marine occurrences like starfish wasting disease that continues to cause mysterious and dramatic die-offs along the Pacific coast from Mexico to Alaska including Howe Sound. Dr. Martin Haulena, veterinarian for the Vancouver Aquarium recently said, "This (wasting disease) is, if not THE, certainly one of the biggest wildlife die-offs that have ever been recorded, and we're not just talking marine die-offs." The summer of 2016 also saw a highly unusual and unprecedented explosion of phytoplankton causing the waters of Howe Sound (and Georgia Strait) to turn bright, almost florescent green. While the causes of these alarming phenomenon are still be investigated, scientists agree on the scale of the problem and say evidence points to rising ocean acidification.</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2515	592 - 9	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2516	592 - 10	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2517	592 - 11	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The impact of the noise, light and air pollution and the ugly scar of an open pit mine in one of the most beautiful fjords in the world and a BC landmark on the Sea to Sky corridor, will be immense.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2518	592 - 12	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The economic benefits to BURNCO are evident, but the potentially negative economic impacts to other sectors are significant.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2519	592 - 13	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>It will damage BC's multi-billion dollar tourism industry, as well as having a negative impact on the recreational and commercial fishers, tourism operators, boaters, resident and recreational property owners and numerous children's camps with, literally thousands of campers each year that currently enjoy Howe Sound's ecosystem. There is a great potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that could accrue to the local economy. The area is used extensively by the movie and TV production sector for filming. Reindustrialization would put this at risk and, as taxpayers and residents, we are absolutely not prepared to take this risk.</p> <p>SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS: 1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver's ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see "SuperNatural, British Columbia", how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2520	592 - 14	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2521	592 - 15	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2522	592 - 16	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2523	592 - 17	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2524	592 - 18	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2525	592 - 19	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2526	592 - 20	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to ‘strong arm’ the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as “the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat”.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2527	592 - 21	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco’s own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2528	592 - 22	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2529	592 - 23	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2530	592 - 24	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2531	592 - 25	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
2532	592 - 26	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2533	592 - 27	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine absolutely will not add to the beauty of the area but only severely detract.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2534	592 - 28	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The local residents of this area (and beyond) are committed to preserve the marine ecological viability and sustainability of our treasured Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2535	592 - 29	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	However, at this point, and for very justifiable reasons, we are extremely sceptical and disillusioned by the provincial and federal environmental review processes being applied provincially and federally. The environmental review process for another potentially hugely damaging re-industrialization project in Howe Sound, Woodfibre LNG, was the first to be approved after the 2015 election of the Trudeau Liberal government. Despite the new government's promises to revamp this process before putting such projects to the test, they used the extant, deeply flawed Harper Government environmental review process and gave the project the go-ahead. We, the public were not heard, thus giving democracy in our country a very black eye.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2536	592 - 30	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	The scientific research done (by the proponents themselves) for that project was deeply flawed as was the assessment of the actual fisheries values of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare and environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>
2537	592 - 31	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	Also the public comments received for that project were the highest number of public submissions for any project in the history of Canada and over 94% of these submissions were opposed to the project. Absolutely no social license was granted for that industrial project for Howe Sound by the vast majority of the 12,000 residents who live here, exposing a ugly tear in our democratic process.	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project life has been reduced from 20-30 years to 16 years, and the maximum depth of excavation has been reduced from 55 metres to 35 metres;</li> <li>- There are no proposed discharges to, or withdrawals from, McNab Creek;</li> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Reduced the size of the pit lake as the northern edge has been moved away from the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke.</li> <li>- Pit lake designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. The elevation of the pit lake will also be used to manage base flows in the natural groundwater watercourses below the pit lake.</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Areas progressively reclaimed during the operational phase will be re-vegetated to control erosion.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> <li>- Replaced wash water sedimentation ponds and associated discharges with a 95% efficient wash plant that uses recycled water from two large storage tanks. The 5% loss (via retention, evaporation and absorption) will be supplemented with make-up water from a ground water well. No wash water will be discharged.</li> <li>- Fines generated from the crushing, screening, washing of material will be extracted from the wash water and mechanically dried and compressed into sediment cakes which will be used in progressive reclamation of the onsite fines disposal area.</li> <li>- Covered or enclosed Project components and/or operating under wet conditions (e.g., fine water spray) to reduced potential</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2538	592 - 32	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	This project has previously been turned down twice for consideration by the Province of BC.	Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.  Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.
2539	592 - 33	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	And now with threats from climate change and its impact upon our ecosystem, it's even less appropriate and justifiable.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.  Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.
2540	592 - 34	Rudi and Gillian Darling Kovanic	Bowen Island, BC	For this reason we are requesting that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the BC Environmental Assessment office fulfill their mandate as true environmental assessors and turn down this unacceptable open pit gravel mine proposal for McNab Creek, Howe Sound. A NO decision will go a long way to restoring our faith in the review process and our government agencies. Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2541	593 - 1	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	Please see the following list below for issues that should be seriously addressed seriously before this project proceeds.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2542	593 - 2	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	1. The gravel quarry would be hard on 21 species officially at risk - including Coastal Cutthroat Trout, and Roosevelt elk, which were re-introduced some years ago and are valued by hunters.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2543	593 - 3	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2544	593 - 4	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2545	593 - 5	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>2. Fish/fish habitat:</p> <p>a) The project's potential to cause serious harm to fish and fish habitat, due to changing hydrological patterns that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Affect the water and salinity levels in McNab Creek, As they dig down to remove gravel, the fresh water from the estuary will be siphoned into the pit, which will change the salinity of McNab Creek and impact the salmon runs.</li> <li>-Lead to salt water seeping into the estuary ground water – which would kill the plants there.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2546	593 - 6	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>b) DFO is very worried about the fish and fish habitat in McNab Creek, particularly chum and coho salmon. The Vancouver Aquarium is concerned re the salmon, and re rockfish at the estuary mouth.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2547	593 - 7	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>c) The planned artificial salmon spawning channel would do nothing to compensate for the damage to fish and fish habitat in the McNab estuary.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m<sup>2</sup> of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
2548	593 - 8	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>3. The effects of wet mining (digging the gravel out of water, where the estuary forest used to be): Burnco's argument that there won't be dust because they're mining "wet" is also misleading because the dust just becomes silt. The silt will kill the plant and animal life in the estuary.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2549	593 - 9	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2550	593 - 10	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2551	593 - 11	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2552	593 - 12	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>
2553	593 - 13	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2554	593 - 14	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2555	593 - 15	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	4. The project will cause dust, noise and light pollution (both on land and at sea – on the dock) for wildlife, local residents and also for recreational users of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2556	593 - 16	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	5. Would require SLRD to rezone this land, moving this land into industrial zoning forever.	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2557	593 - 17	Alison Fischer	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Compare the benefits of this project: Profits for Burnco, and 12 full time jobs - to the above described serious harm of this project would cause.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2558	594 - 1	Robbie Holloway	Not Stated	<p>I strongly do not want a gravel pit at McNab. Forgot any good crabbing/prawning. The place would forever be tarnished.</p> <p>Please do the right thing.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2559	595 - 1	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	<p>I am a member of the local stream and salmon enhancement society where I live. I am deeply concerned for the protection of McNab Creek stream, estuary and valley. This is an area of very important habitat for many species, elk, bears, many birds and the 4 species of wild salmon that spawn there.</p> <p>The mud flats and marshy areas are breeding areas and nurseries for a multitude of marine organisms that form the food web of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2560	595 - 2	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	<p>I am a member of the local stream and salmon enhancement society where I live. I am deeply concerned for the protection of McNab Creek stream, estuary and valley. This is an area of very important habitat for many species, elk, bears, many birds and the 4 species of wild salmon that spawn there.</p> <p>The mud flats and marshy areas are breeding areas and nurseries for a multitude of marine organisms that form the food web of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2561	595 - 3	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	<p>Millions of dollars and much dedicated work has been invested in the recovery of Howe Sound from damage caused by past industrialization. The expensive Sea to Sky highway makes the beauty of Howe Sound known to visitors from around the world, as well as all of us. Now that whales, orcas, dolphins, herring and many other fish and animals have returned to these waters it seems very regressive to allow a return to destructive industrial use.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2562	595 - 4	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	The value of Howe Sound for recreation, tourism, and environmental enjoyment by the ever increasing population in the area would outweigh the 12 jobs and cheap gravel with its constant noise and light pollution day and night 365 days a year for the next 16 or more years. Really ! Please save Howe Sound from this destructive open pit gravel mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2563	595 - 5	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	The value of Howe Sound for recreation, tourism, and environmental enjoyment by the ever increasing population in the area would outweigh the 12 jobs and cheap gravel with its constant noise and light pollution day and night 365 days a year for the next 16 or more years. Really ! Please save Howe Sound from this destructive open pit gravel mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2564	595 - 6	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	The value of Howe Sound for recreation, tourism, and environmental enjoyment by the ever increasing population in the area would outweigh the 12 jobs and cheap gravel with its constant noise and light pollution day and night 365 days a year for the next 16 or more years. Really ! Please save Howe Sound from this destructive open pit gravel mine.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2565	595 - 7	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	The value of Howe Sound for recreation, tourism, and environmental enjoyment by the ever increasing population in the area would outweigh the 12 jobs and cheap gravel with its constant noise and light pollution day and night 365 days a year for the next 16 or more years. Really ! Please save Howe Sound from this destructive open pit gravel mine.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2566	595 - 8	Nancy Wigen	Not Stated	The value of Howe Sound for recreation, tourism, and environmental enjoyment by the ever increasing population in the area would outweigh the 12 jobs and cheap gravel with its constant noise and light pollution day and night 365 days a year for the next 16 or more years. Really ! Please save Howe Sound from this destructive open pit gravel mine.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
2567	596 - 1	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	As Chairperson of The McNab Strata Community, adjacent to the Burnco Lands, we continue to have outstanding questions and concerns of Burnco's gravel mining proposal. Many of our community members attended the recent information sessions in Squamish, Gibsons , and West Vancouver. We have had many meetings with Burnco since their first project proposal eight years ago. Our community has been cooperative and engaging with Burnco and their consultants ( Golder ) on conducting studies.	BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.
2568	596 - 2	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	It is important to clarify, from our perspective, statements made in the EIS:  - Properties at McNab should not be referred to as "seasonal". Due to the temperate BC Climate, property owners occupy their homes at different times throughout the year, including the winter months. Many of the residents over the years have considered McNab as their principal residence, and we anticipate this to continue.	Acknowledged. We have not intended to refer to the McNab Strata as seasonal residences. For the purposed of the effects assessment, they have been considered the closest community to the proposed Project site.
2569	596 - 3	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	It is important to clarify, from our perspective, statements made in the EIS:  - The last study date indicates that one generator was in use by a McNab resident. Our community does not rely on generators for our electrical power and those that have them do not use them regularly. Solar and battery banks are more representative of our energy use.	In the baseline report (Appendix 9.2-A) the following statement was made regarding generators "Likewise, the baseline noise levels at the Community are also likely influenced by noise from temporary power generators and human activities, whereas the baseline noise levels at NR1 are not." No other mention of generators was made within the report. Baseline noise measurements at the Community were taken over a four day period to determine the baseline noise at this receptor.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2570	596 - 4	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Peace and quiet is highly valued by our community. We believe the noise baseline studies are not representative of the local and regional study areas.	<p>In BC, there are no provincial noise requirements or standard methods for completing baseline noise surveys or environmental noise assessments for gravel load-out facilities like the Project. In the absence of formal guidance, the environmental noise from the Project was assessed in accordance with noise regulations specified by the BC Oil and Gas Commission (the Commission) in the document British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline (Commission 2009). The Guideline is only strictly applicable to oil and gas facilities, but is assumed to represent best practices for treatment of environmental noise from all industrial facilities in BC. Additional guidance for conducting the noise baseline study and processing the data was obtained from the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) document Directive 038: Noise Control (EUB 2007). In many ways Directive 038 is similar to the Guideline, but Directive 038 provides more details on appropriate methods for conducting field measurements than are available in the Guideline. Further guidance on the processing of noise baseline data was taken from the Health Canada document Useful Information for Environmental Assessments (Health Canada 2010).</p> <p>Noise measurements at the Strata were performed on both October 15-16 and October 26-28, 2013; one monitoring period had active logging and the other did not. Directive 038 requires three hours of valid monitoring data for the monitoring result to be deemed valid. The valid monitoring duration far exceeded this minimum duration and is therefore considered valid by Direction 038. The nighttime period results of the two measurements, when monitoring would not impact the measurements, were within 1 dBA of each other (see Table 9.2-9 in Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS), which is within the error of the monitoring equipment.</p>
2571	596 - 5	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - At a recent meeting with Burnco our strata council had, they are saying that the average noise is anticipated to be an average of 45 decibels, but at the information sessions, we are told different numbers.	Average noise levels are not presented in the EAC Application/EIS. Average noise levels are only discussed in terms of baseline noise levels.
2572	596 - 6	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Are both study dates conducted in our community representative of Alberta's directive 38 guidelines, such as being conducted during summertime conditions? Both studies were performed during autumn, where creek flows are historically higher.	Baseline monitoring program was conducted at four receptors, NR1 – NR4 during the summer months. The baseline monitoring at the Community (e.g., NR5) was conducted during October to capture on-going logging activities in the area.
2573	596 - 7	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Do the guidelines and the Oil and Gas Commission account for noise during the construction period of between 4 months and 2 years?	<p>The noise assessment presented in the EAC Application/EIS assessed the potential effects of noise throughout the construction (2 years), operation (16 years) and reclamation and closure phases. The British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline (Commission 2009), the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) document Directive 038: Noise Control (EUB 2007) and guidance on the processing of noise baseline data in the Health Canada document Useful Information for Environmental Assessments (Health Canada 2010) were used in the assessment.</p> <p>As discussion in Section 9.2.2.1 of the EAC Application/EIS, the Commission Guideline does not provide noise limits for construction. They provide recommendations for mitigation measures to reduce construction noise, which are outlined in Section 9.2.5.3. Health Canada provides criteria for assessing construction noise depending on the anticipated length of construction. As discussed in Section 9.2.2.2, on the grounds of conservatism, it was assumed all construction phases would last longer than one year and therefore were subject to the same criteria as operations.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2574	596 - 8	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - This project is in BC and so why are there no regulations applicable to operating next to a residential community? The BC building code requires sound proofing between residential units up to a certain decibel. The same should apply here.	In the absence of formal guidance, the environmental noise from the Project was assessed in accordance with noise regulations specified by the BC Oil and Gas Commission in the document British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline, by Health Canada in Useful Information for Environmental Assessments, and the Sunshine Coast Regional District Noise Control Bylaw No. 597, 2008. Operations will be restricted to 7 AM to 9 PM, consistent with the SCR D Noise Control Bylaw section regarding Machine Noise. The BC building code that requires sound proofing between attached residential and commercial units do not apply to the Proposed Project.
2575	596 - 9	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - The noise assumption that logging 1.2 kilometers from the McNab Strata community receptor would continue throughout the lifetime of mining operations. The assumptions do not detail the exact types of equipment in use 1.2 kilometres away and it assumes logging is continuous which is not the case.	The baseline monitoring at the Community (e.g., NR5) was conducted during October to capture logging and non-logging monitoring data. The exact equipment that was being used during the logging activities is unknown but is assumed to be consistent with the type of logging equipment that will continue to be used throughout the Proposed Project.
2576	596 - 10	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Summertime creek flow conditions are not representative of actual baseline noise in the LSA, and cumulatively during the lifetime of the mine.	The Commission Guideline and Directive 038 specify that the assessment should be conducted under summertime conditions.
2577	596 - 11	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Are the wind conditions representative of the average annual conditions?	Directive 038 specifies that baseline noise monitoring should only be conducted when wind speeds are less than 15 km/h. As discussed in Section 9.2.4.3.2.1 of the EAC Application/EIS, weather data were collected using Kestrel 4500 pocket weather meters during the noise monitoring, set-up near the noise monitoring sites. The weather meters recorded wind speed and direction, temperature, and relative humidity data every five minutes. Data from the weather meters were used as required by Directive 038 for the interpretation of the logged noise data. When wind speeds were higher than this limit or when wind noise was audible in the sound recording, noise data were considered to be invalid such that wind did not increase the baseline noise levels.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2578	596 - 12	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - We do not consider the natural ambient sounds of bird calls and creek flows the same as equipment noise.	<p>In the absence of relevant existing or approved industrial facilities, the Commission Guideline mandates the use of specific Ambient Specific Levels (ASL) values to represent Baseline Case noise levels. The Commission Guideline discusses the use of an Ambient Monitoring Adjustment (Section 2.3.4 of the Guideline), when the ASL's are not thought to be representative of the actual sound environment. The only two cases where it may be necessary to consider an ambient monitoring adjustment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Areas considered to be pristine; and</li> <li>■ Areas with non-energy industrial activity that would influence the background noise levels.</li> </ul> <p>The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: "A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment."</p> <p>McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.</p> <p>Although there is industrial activity in the area, it does not cause the baseline noise levels to exceed the Commission Guideline ASL's, and therefore the ambient monitoring correction is not used. As such, for the noise assessment based on the Commission Guideline, Baseline Case noise levels at relevant receptors were established based on the ASL values specified in the Commission Guideline.</p> <p>The HC Guidance indicates that Baseline Case noise levels should be established through field measurements. As such, for the noise assessment based on the HC Guidance, the Baseline Case noise levels at relevant receptors were established based on field measurements conducted in the summer of 2012 and fall of 2013 at five representative receptors within the LSA and RSA. Noise from birds, insects, and other animal activities very near the monitoring location was considered not representative of normal conditions at the monitoring locations and was removed as recommended in Directive 038. Other sources not considered representative of normal conditions were: technician activities, vehicular traffic near the monitoring location, airplane flyovers, rain, and thunder.</p>
2579	596 - 13	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - On the two occasions of baseline studies in question, I was present at the community receptor between residents 5-10, and am not confident that the monitoring equipment was placed in the recommended location( i.e., 10 metres from a building or sloped bank). Has the proposed clamshell dredger with grisly crusher and its associated processing equipment been factored into the noise studies?	<p>Yes. The Clamshell Dredge and Grizzly Screen were considered in the noise assessment. The noise associated with these two pieces of equipment are presented in Table 9.2-39 of Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Directive 038 specifies that the distance requirement to the nearest building may be altered if it is physically impossible or acoustically illogical. The meter was placed in an appropriate position based on the surrounding conditions and topography.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2580	596 - 14	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - Why are vibrations and low frequency noises not studied? Are studies on the proposed vibrating conveyor being assessed?	<p>Based on Directive 038, potential Low Frequency Noise issues associated with the Proposed Project operation were assessed as presented in Section 9.2.5.2.2.2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Several aspects of the conveyor system required for the Proposed Project were included in the noise assessment, these are Conveyor System in Clamshell Dredge Operation, Conveyor System in Crush Plant, Conveyor System in Wash Plant, Conveyor System in Barge Loading Area, Conveyor Motors in Clamshell Dredge Operation, Conveyor Motors in Crush Plant, Conveyor Motors in Wash Plant, and Conveyor Motors in Barge Loading Area. The noise associated with these pieces of equipment are presented in Table 9.2-39 of Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Project will not be a significant source of vibration due to the nature of the on-site sources and therefore a full assessment was not included.</p>
2581	596 - 15	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - We are told there will be only 1 wheel loader in the processing area where there is a possibility of using strobe lights, rather than a back-up alarm. Does best management practices allow these options?	Broadband alarms and strobe lights will be used during operations to reduce environmental annoyance.
2582	596 - 16	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - We understand there is a substantial increase of noise, but why are the effects predicted to be negligible or not significant to our rural community? Does this mean there are no potential noise effects on our community, the LSA and the RSA?	<p>The significance of noise effects were considered negligible-not significant if they satisfied the following requirements (presented in Table 9.2-7 of the EAC application/EIS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Had a negligible magnitude based on the worst-case of the Commission Guideline and HC Guidance noise assessment.</li> <li>- Had a low magnitude, was considered local in extent with a short or medium term duration.</li> <li>- Had a low magnitude, was considered regional or beyond regional in extent with a short-term duration.</li> </ul> <p>As all potential noise effect were considered to be of negligible magnitude (e.g., did not exceed the established Commission Guideline and HC Guidance), all residual effects were considered negligible-not significant.</p>
2583	596 - 17	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Noise - We believe more studies are needed, with complete information, sharing the actual baselines of the Local and Regional Study areas.	<p>A comprehensive baseline report is provided in Appendix 9.2-A. The baseline is consistent with guidance provided in the British Columbia Noise Control Best Practices Guideline (Commission 2009), the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) document Directive 038: Noise Control (EUB 2007) and guidance on the processing of noise baseline data in the Health Canada document Useful Information for Environmental Assessments (Health Canada 2010).</p> <p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. BURNCO will also develop a project-specific website that will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed regarding the Project, including project schedule, construction activities, operating information, and noise and air quality monitoring data.</p>
2584	596 - 18	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Operating Hours: In the application it states "work hours up to 14 hours a day, and will commit to abide to the Sunshine Coast Regional District 'Noise Bylaw' 7am-9pm." Burnco's operations manager said they are basing operations on four ten hour shifts per week. If the operations are being planned on this number of shifts then why don't the work hours reflect this? We don't trust the hours of operation.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2585	596 - 19	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Future Use of the Property - There is potential of Burnco applying for an addendum to this application of alternate areas to mine within the Burnco Lands. We are concerned the mine will continue to be in operation beyond the 20 year period of this application.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
2586	596 - 20	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Visual - We are concerned about the visual impacts changing with the future use of our common property. To state that only 6 residents will be able to view the barge loading facility and buildings on the foreshore is simply not true. Depictions of other light sources are not adequately addressed, and at least 10 of the 14 current dwellings do not look directly at the Port Mellon pulp mill. More information is needed since there may be more residential dwellings in the future. The visual baseline studies are not representative of our community. Possible safety and security lighting on pit lake and processing area, stockpiles size changing as mitigation for noise. If the stockpiles are changing in size, how effective are those to minimize noise? Our common property if logged and trees falling along McNab creek and berm/dykes will enable more visual of mine site.	<p>The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the residents of the McNab would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed, and it is a publically accessible location that would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata. The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use. Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs./day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. No operational lighting of the pit lake or processing area is proposed. Lighting will be limited to what is required for worker safety, site security and navigation. Mitigation of light effects includes the use of fixtures that reduce light 'spillage' beyond the direct area of illumination. The proposed heights of stockpiles of processed material are presented in Table 2-11 as assessed in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2587	596 - 21	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Flooding: We are concerned about our domestic water quality and quantity should there be any flooding due to increased volumes of water flows down the creek due to those diversions. More studies should be conducted to consider the potential for erosion due to increasing water volumes factoring in changes in the future due to climate change. Can the dykes proposed be effective, and will they divert more water during storm events toward our community? Throughout operations and after closure, will the groundwater table change and affect our community's health and wellbeing?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines. Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p> <p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2588	596 - 22	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Marine Resources: Has there been adequate studies conducted outside the proposed project footprint and adjoining intertidal areas to consider if marine resources will be adversely affected?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2589	596 - 23	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Is it in the best interests of Burnco to create a new habitat fisheries compensation channel on the estuary in return for displacing a functioning and productive one in the centre of the project area?	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2590	596 - 24	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Will Harlequin Creek on the west side of the valley be negatively affected by construction, operations, and reclamation?	<p>Potential effects to Harlequin Creek as a result of the Proposed Project were assessed in the EAC Application/EIS. The potential effects to fish in Harlequin Creek assessed included increases in suspended sediments and artificial lighting (provided in Section 5.2.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS). With the application of known and effective mitigation (i.e., in-water works during fisheries work windows, environmental monitoring by a qualified Environmental Monitor (EM), and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)), the significance of these residual effects were considered to be negligible – not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2591	596 - 25	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	We are concerned about increased wake from Burnco boat traffic causing damage to our breakwater and dock. Speed must be regulated and monitored. Cumulative impacts of increased boat traffic especially during construction need to be accounted for.	<p>The matter of Proposed Project associated wake effects on the shoreline and other vessels was considered in Vol. 2 Section 7.2 Marine Transportation. Vessel Wake and Marine Navigation were the identified VCs for marine transportation. Potential effects to recreational and tourism are provided in Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.3. A vessel wake wash analysis was undertaken for the Proposed Project environmental assessment and is presented in Appendix 7.2-A. Wave intensity based on vessel characteristics was a measureable indicator used in the environmental assessment.</p> <p>Wake wash associated with BURNCO vessel traffic is anticipated to be relatively minor. Wake wash energy from BURNCO associated tug and barge movements is anticipated to be less than 1% when compared to the total energy from naturally occurring wind waves along both routes.</p> <p>As described in Part E of the Application, mitigation measures to ensure vessel safety will include, but not be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marking the marine waters of the Project construction zone with appropriate lighting, buoys and signage; and</li> <li>- Providing the appropriate notice to mariners and notices to shipping.</li> </ul> <p>The following additional measures will also be included in the Marine Transport Management Plan prepared by BURNCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining radio watch;</li> <li>- Timing of work; and</li> <li>- Providing tug assist services.</li> </ul> <p>BURNCO is committed to providing additional mitigation measures to ensure the safety of other mariners as put forth in the Navigation Protection Act review report issued by Transport Canada.</p>
2592	596 - 26	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Cumulative Impacts: We do not believe the studies reflect the total cumulative impact of dust from conveyor and operations. During the summertime dry season, we are especially concerned about dust and the increased trucking during reclamation and ongoing logging operations.	Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for air quality indicators (increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual) - See Section 5.7.5.7). All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2593	596 - 27	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Fish and Wildlife Concerns: We are concerned that the permanent loss of small rearing pools in McNab due to increased flows during operations could result in a permanent loss of habitat. This mine removes productive land that sustains life forever and restricts wildlife corridors to the estuary. Just the other day our neighbour saw a black bear by the mouth of McNab Creek looking for fish. Black bears were not studied and yet they rely on access to wild fish for food and they are an important part of our ecosystem. We are concerned that important species at risk are missing from the studies, such as wild trumpeter swans we have recently seen on the estuary on their migrating routes?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2594	596 - 28	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Fish and Wildlife Concerns: We are concerned that the permanent loss of small rearing pools in McNab due to increased flows during operations could result in a permanent loss of habitat. This mine removes productive land that sustains life forever and restricts wildlife corridors to the estuary. Just the other day our neighbour saw a black bear by the mouth of McNab Creek looking for fish. Black bears were not studied and yet they rely on access to wild fish for food and they are an important part of our ecosystem. We are concerned that important species at risk are missing from the studies, such as wild trumpeter swans we have recently seen on the estuary on their migrating routes?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2595	596 - 29	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Fish and Wildlife Concerns: We are concerned that the permanent loss of small rearing pools in McNab due to increased flows during operations could result in a permanent loss of habitat. This mine removes productive land that sustains life forever and restricts wildlife corridors to the estuary. Just the other day our neighbour saw a black bear by the mouth of McNab Creek looking for fish. Black bears were not studied and yet they rely on access to wild fish for food and they are an important part of our ecosystem. We are concerned that important species at risk are missing from the studies, such as wild trumpeter swans we have recently seen on the estuary on their migrating routes?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2596	596 - 30	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Fish and Wildlife Concerns: We are concerned that the permanent loss of small rearing pools in McNab due to increased flows during operations could result in a permanent loss of habitat. This mine removes productive land that sustains life forever and restricts wildlife corridors to the estuary. Just the other day our neighbour saw a black bear by the mouth of McNab Creek looking for fish. Black bears were not studied and yet they rely on access to wild fish for food and they are an important part of our ecosystem. We are concerned that important species at risk are missing from the studies, such as wild trumpeter swans we have recently seen on the estuary on their migrating routes?	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Black bear was not specifically identified as candidate or selected valued component for the purpose of the EA. Potential effects on Grizzly Bear are a reasonable surrogate representing mobile and wide ranging mammals such as wolverine, black bear and wolf.
2597	596 - 31	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Fish and Wildlife Concerns: We are concerned that the permanent loss of small rearing pools in McNab due to increased flows during operations could result in a permanent loss of habitat. This mine removes productive land that sustains life forever and restricts wildlife corridors to the estuary. Just the other day our neighbour saw a black bear by the mouth of McNab Creek looking for fish. Black bears were not studied and yet they rely on access to wild fish for food and they are an important part of our ecosystem. We are concerned that important species at risk are missing from the studies, such as wild trumpeter swans we have recently seen on the estuary on their migrating routes?	The rationale for the identification of candidate and selected valued components (VCs) is presented in Section 4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Trumpeter Swan ( <i>Cygnus buccinator</i> ) is not an at-risk species in BC.
2598	596 - 32	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	We are concerned the titanium levels will be high enough to impact fish outside the pit area escaping through the groundwater. Has this been considered?	Predictions for surface water concentrations of total and dissolved titanium are available for two locations downstream of the pit lake (MCF-6 and MCF-12) where fish are present. The predicted concentrations of titanium at these locations are within 10% of the baseline concentration, therefore the project is not expected to increase the titanium concentration in streams downstream of the pit lake.
2599	596 - 33	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Removal of Trees: We have been told by Burnco on a number of occasions that no mature trees will be removed. The processing area being proposed is now below the BC hydro powerline, where productive land, second growth trees, and fish and wildlife habitat will be displaced during construction and operations. How is this the best location?	The terrestrial LSA is 569 ha in size and does not contain any old growth forest. Approximately 20.0% (113.8 ha) of the Terrestrial LSA is considered mature forest, occurring mainly on the east side of McNab Creek, and as elevation increases from the valley bottom on either side of the LSA. These areas could be considered merchantable timber. Merchantable timber will be salvaged on site.  The trees and vegetation where the pit lake is planned will be permanently lost (28.2 ha). However, reclamation activities post-closure will re-establish mature forest on site. Roosevelt elk winter habitat will be restored through the creation of 24.3 ha of mature forest over approximately 25 years. In addition, a total of 31 ha of moderate to high suitability Roosevelt elk habitat (based on habitat suitability index modelling) to the north, east and south of the Project area will be protected and left unaffected by the Project. Establishing mature forest will also provide suitable habitat for other mature forest species such as northern goshawk and marbled murrelet. Therefore, the removal of trees to establish the pit lake will be compensated for.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2600	596 - 34	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Invasive Species: Has equipment wash stations been considered to minimize the spread of invasive plant species?	The conceptual Invasive Plant Species Management Plan is provided in section 16.2.2.4.1 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Invasive Species Management Plan will include information on cleaning/washing procedures for Project vehicles and equipment to minimize the potential for introduction and proliferation of invasive plants.
2601	596 - 35	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Key informants: Burnco refers to a list of Key Informants for local knowledge, however there was no interview conducted of residents of the area. We are happy to provide our observations of the area over the past 45 years, including sightings of fish and wildlife to the Working Group committee.	<p>The sample of key informants described in Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS (Non-traditional Land and Resource Use) was not intended to be exhaustive of all stakeholders potentially affected by the Proposed Project, but rather was intended to be wide ranging enough to confirm and expand on non-traditional land and resource use information available from the referenced secondary sources. Key informants interviewed or provided data for this report included representatives from recreational groups and tourism operators, as well as DFO and MFLNRO. Specifically key informants included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Burrard Yacht Club</li> <li>- Coastal Inlet Adventures</li> <li>- DFO</li> <li>- Don's Water Taxi</li> <li>- Gambier Island Local Trust</li> <li>- Gibson Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>- Islands Trust</li> <li>- MFLNRO</li> <li>- Recreation Sites and Trails BC</li> <li>- Sewell's Marina</li> <li>- Squamish Yacht Club</li> <li>- Sunshine Kayaks</li> <li>- Thunderbird Yacht Club</li> </ul> <p>Conditions C-5.1 through C-5.3 (Table 19.1) outlines the Proponent commitment to ongoing engagement with the McNab Creek Strata. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. BURNCO has also proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2602	596 - 36	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Significant Social and Economic Effects: The noise and industrial activity associated with this mine will result in our loss of enjoyment of our property and surrounding McNab Valley. People come here to spend time with family and friends. They hunt, fish and enjoy the quiet. This is not measured or considered in the EIS.	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). A change in the quality of the environmental setting (noise, air, and visual quality conditions) of these experiences was a potential effect that was considered in the assessment of each of these valued components. Expected changes in air, noise and visual qualities due to the Proposed Project were also considered in reaged to potential effects of the Proposed Project on the Real estate valued component. These expected changes are summarised in Table 6.1-17. These changes would alter the current environmental character of the Project Property and its surrounding area, including the McNab Creek Strata property, through changes to existing noise, air quality and visual resource conditions, but residual air and noise emissions associated with the Proposed Project are not anticipated to change air quality and noise conditions to the extent that they exceed government regulatory standards. Screening by natural vegetation on the McNab Creek Strata lots and the Property is expected to shield the majority of McNab Creek Strata residences from having a view of either the Proposed Project's facilities or activities.</p> <p>Mitigation measures outlined in the assessments of noise, air quality, visual resource and marine transportation would serve to help address the potential effects of the Proposed Project on the quality of the environmental setting of outdoor recreation and tourism experiences and on the Real Estate valued component.</p>
2603	596 - 37	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	Loss of revenue from hunting permits are not noted.	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' is a valued component in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement or other effects on recreational hunting are anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use has never been permitted here. As no effect due to the Proposed Project on recreational hunting activity is anticipated, then there would be no change in hunting permit revenues.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2604	596 - 38	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Our property values are perceived to be greatly affected. No real estate agents were interviewed by Burnco. The pit lake is not a benefit or vision for this area residents want.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS. The assessment of the Real Estate valued component concluded that a moderate adverse effect on McNab Creek Strata real estate is predicted due to an unquantified negative effect on real estate values resulting from the changed land use on the Proposed Project site and small changes in noise, air quality and the visual resource due to the Proposed Project (see Section 6.1.5.2.4). To support the assessment of the Real Estate valued component, several substantive studies, focused on the effects of mining on residential property values, were sourced and reviewed to collect information on past experience with direction and magnitude of value effects and the drivers of those value effects on residential properties due to nearby mining operations.</p> <p>Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant. Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p> <p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2605	596 - 39	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	There are no benefits accruing to our community.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2606	596 - 40	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>Mitigation and monitoring - There is no information on who is monitoring this project and we do not believe it should be up to residents and First Nations to do this work. We do not have confidence mitigation will be enough to offset the negative impacts on our community. We have low confidence mitigation and monitoring will be followed through and be effective.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2607	596 - 41	McNab Strata Community	McNab Creek, BC	<p>In conclusion, based on the information provided, the McNab Creek Strata VAS 850 believe the BURNCO Aggregate Project will cause significant social, economic, environmental harm, and affect the health of our community.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2608	597 - 1	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comments to Environmental Assessment Office regarding Burnco Aggregate Project McNab Creek, Howe Sound, BC Submitted October 2, 2016</p> <p>Dr. Robert Turner, 710 Minnows Lane, Bowen Island, BC V0N1G2 Personal background BSc Geological Engineering, Queens University; MSc, PhD Geology, Stanford University Research scientist, Geological Survey of Canada, Vancouver 1989-2014 Resident, Bowen Island, 1989 - present Mayor, Bowen Island, 2005-2011 Lead organizer, 1991 Howe Sound Environmental Science Workshop and co-editor of conference proceedings (Levings et al, 1991).</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2609	597 - 2	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Estuaries are ecological jewels. The entire Howe Sound inlet has very limited wild and functional estuary. McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. Why would you mine it?</p> <p>McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. Estuaries form a tiny portion of Howe Sound's total shoreline but are its richest shoreline habitats in terms so biodiversity and biological productivity. Estuaries are ecological jewels in the broader context of Howe Sound's ecological function and deserve our highest protection.</p> <p>Question 1.1: Where else in BC has an estuary been mined for gravel? If there is/has been such a mine, what environmental mitigation strategies where employed. Was remediation successful? If not, why would the Burnco application be allowed to set a precedent for such an ecologically damaging activity?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2610	597 - 3	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Burnco proposal largely blocks the animal corridor between upper McNab valley and shoreline, functionally disconnecting estuary from uplands.</p> <p>The proposal intends to fill three quarters of the lower one kilometer of the McNab Creek valley with a 24/7 industrial operation that will alienate that area from wildlife, and spread industrial noise throughout the lower valley for at least the project lifetime. It is inconceivable that this industrial noise and land alienation will not greatly limit the function of the lower valley as habitat and greatly disconnect migration of mammals such as elk, black bear, wolves, and grizzly bear between upper valley and the shore. Local observations show the estuary is heavily used by elk and black bear, and occasionally by grizzly bear and wolves. I have visited McNab Creek many times and have seen the tracks.</p> <p>Question 2.1: How will the project proposal offset the project impacts on elk, bear and wolf migration along the valley floor from upper valley to estuary?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2611	597 - 4	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 2.2: Given ongoing forestry operations in McNab Creek valley, and extensive past cutting of valley floor forests, and recent construction of the Box Canyon power project, how does the additional impact of the Burnco proposal relate to the cumulative impacts of other past and ongoing industry in the valley?</p> <p>Question 2.3: What cumulative effects assessment has been made of ecosystem health of the McNab Creek valley?</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2612	597 - 5	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The project will permanently isolate McNab Creek from migration across the majority of its natural floodplain.</p> <p>The natural habit of the river is to wander back and forth across its natural floodplain and estuary. Berms surrounding the proposed pit will permanently restrict McNab Creek to the eastern margin of the estuary. The berms will isolate the Creek from three quarters of its natural fan delta, removing the Creek's ability to directly replenish sediment to the western part of the estuary and create diverse habitats. Given ongoing sea level rise, forecast to be at least 1 m rise by 2100, this lack of direct sedimentation to the western estuary will increase the risk of shoreline erosion, wet meadow and tidal flat erosion, and shoreline retreat, with consequent valuable habitat loss throughout this area.</p> <p>Question 3.1: What mitigation is proposed to offset the loss of natural river-mouth migration, and the loss of sediment deposition and natural aggradation across the western side of the estuary?</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>
2613	597 - 6	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Why permit a "wet" gravel mine?</p> <p>Almost all of BC's gravel resources are located on forested hillsides. These "dry" aggregate resources are abundant in the south coast region, sufficient for decades of development needs. Dry deposits typically do not occupy vital ecological landscapes given that forested slopes are extensive (and therefore not unique) throughout the region. Burnco on the other hand is applying to mine a "wet" gravel resource that occupies a critical high ecological value estuary. This makes no sense to my geological experience. It is well understood that the mining industry doesn't get to choose where a resource is. Sometimes the resource is in the wrong place to mine. McNab Creek estuary is just such a location.</p> <p>Question 4.1: Why should a gravel mine be permitted in an ecologically sensitive area, when there are extensive undeveloped gravel resources in much less sensitive areas?</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2614	597 - 7	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Inappropriate location for a Processing/Stockpiles Area</p> <p>At McNab, a forest 30-300m wide of second growth sitka spruce-hemlock forest 80-250 years old fringes the entire estuary shoreline. This mature forest is an essential element of the estuary, forming a natural transition between upland and wet meadow-tidal flats of the intertidal estuary. The entire one kilometer of estuary shoreline with fringing forest, intertidal marsh and mud-sand-cobble tidal flats intact at McNab Creek. This coastal strip is the most valuable and sensitive part of the estuary.</p> <p>The Processing/Stockpiles Area is proposed within the fringing forest of this coastal strip. This will require clearing of a large tract of mature second growth 80-250 year old hemlock-sitka spruce forest. This forest zone is 150-200m wide at the Processing/Stockpiles Area site and all but a sliver-thin buffer will be lost.</p> <p>Question 5.1: Why is the processing facility not located inland, north of the power line, and well back from the most ecologically sensitive area of the estuary?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> </ul> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2615	597 - 8	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Inadequate proposed reclamation plan due to incorrect downgrade of forest capability from Class 1 forest to Class 3 forest</p> <p>The following is based on 4.0 Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan Document, Golder Associates. Forest capability mapping done prior to logging and published in 1984 (Serryk and Perry 1984) rated the project area forests as a Class 1 forest. The proponents argue that, because it is “disturbed”, the area should be downgraded to a Class 3 forest area, and that required reclamation only need to compensate to a Class 3 forest level (page 6). But the proponents provide no evidence of disturbance beyond previous logging.</p> <p>Question 6.1: Why would a provincial government “forest capability” map that was based on observation of the existing forest type (Serryk and Perry 1984) not be the accurate assessment of what the forest capable of growing in the project area? Why would logging of the forest change the capability of the site to grow a forest?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2616	597 - 9	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Proponent soil assessment is inadequate.</p> <p>No soils mapping was conducted by the proponent. Rather a series of soil pits were used to test the soils and interpolate soil characteristics between pits (Figure 3). The pit locations are not on any type of grid, or guided by existing soil mapping, and so the location of the test pits appears arbitrary, and provides no confidence that the soil pits are representative of the soils in the project area.</p> <p>Further, the proponent excludes examination and discussion of the soils in the Processing/Stockpiles Area. The Golder report states on page 6 “The Proposed Project Area consists of unvegetated or sparsely vegetated areas; small pockets of shrub dominated, sapling forest, and young forest structural stages. Mature forest is located to the north and east, outside of the Proposed Project Area.”</p> <p>Question 7.1: Why is there no mention of the mature forest areas that will be cleared for the Processing/Stockpiles Area at the shoreface?</p>	<p>We recognize that soils mapping was conducted at a reconnaissance level and based on existing geotechnical borehole and test pit data and existing publically available soils maps. We believe that this information was sufficient for EAC Application/EIS that required LSA soils mapping at a 1:5000-scale.</p> <p>Subsequent soil surveys including additional soil plot locations in the Processing Area, plus select soil sample collection and analytical testing for soil quality will be completed prior to surface preparation. This information combined with the preliminary EAC Application/EIS soils mapping and geotechnical subsurface data will be used to prepare updated soil maps and soil salvage and reclamation plans as required for the BURNCO Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA).</p> <p>Mature forest areas that will be cleared are noted in Volume 2, Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS: The Proposed Project will remove approximately 3.3% (4 ha) of mature coniferous forest for the marine conveyor belt system in the LSA.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2617	597 - 10	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Curiously, no soil pits were dug in the proposed Processing/Stockpiles Area area where a mature Class 1 forest currently stands.</p> <p>Question 7.2: Why did the proponent not sample any of the soils in the Processing/Stockpiles Area?</p>	<p>No soil pits were dug in the noted areas. Soil sampling and analytical testing for soil quality and reclamation is required to satisfy the Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA). As approved by the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM), a detailed soil sampling program will be provided in the Reclamation and Closure Plan of the BURNCO MAPA. Proposed soil surveys and select sampling will be completed in the Processing Area and mature forest areas prior to construction activities.</p>
2618	597 - 11	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The proponents arguments that given that the land has been logged, therefore its "forest capability" has been reduced from a Class 1 to a Class 3 forest appears to lack basis. The proponents soil pit study does not provide evidence that the sites chosen for sampling are indeed representative of the project area. Confidence in this study is further eroded by the lack of soil sampling of the proposed Processing/Stockpiles Area, a standing Class 1 forest. All this leads to a larger question.</p> <p>Question 7.3: Why is the reclamation plan not based on reestablishing a Class 1 forest after closure?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2619	597 - 12	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Environmental bonding</p> <p>Given the high ecological values of McNab Creek estuary, and the large impacts this proposal will impose on the estuary, and the critical role that estuaries play in Howe Sound, this proposal also poses serious risks to the larger ecosystem health of Howe Sound. Should a mine go ahead, it is critical that environmental reclamation and monitoring of reclamation works be successful to the highest standards. To ensure reclamation compliance, and public confidence that this will indeed be achieved, significant environmental bonds need to be in place.</p> <p>Question 8.1: What criteria are being used to evaluate the necessary level of environmental bonding for reclamation?</p> <p>Question 8.2: What amount of reclamation bonding is required of the proponent before start of works?</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2620	597 - 13	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>This project will expand industrial activity to a new greenfield site in Howe Sound. This project is not compatible with the ongoing recovery of Howe Sound from past industrial activity, nor its recreational use. Is this the highest and best use for Howe Sound?</p> <p>It is widely recognized that Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. A recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy. The Province has invested heavily in this enterprise, not the least of which are the ongoing costs of managing Britannia Mine effluent. As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. A new industrial operation on a new greenfield site with significant ecological impacts is out of step with these trends.</p> <p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2621	597 - 14	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2622	597 - 15	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	Question 9.1: What criteria suggest that this proposal is compatible with the "highest and best use" of the McNab Creek estuary and northern Thorborough Channel?	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2623	597 - 16	Robert Turner	Bowen Island, BC	Question 9.2: What criteria suggest that the impacts of this proposal will not be detrimental to the ongoing recovery of marine ecosystems of Howe Sound?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2624	598 - 1	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Herewith my additional comments (Sections 1-6) and addenda regarding the Burnco Howe Sound Mine Application.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2625	598 - 2	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	1. Please consider my signed comments in the North Shore News, News section, page A9, September 28, 2016, headline "Holistic plan not a mine needed for Howe Sound".	Thank you for providing this article. I has been documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See URL below:  <a href="http://www.nsnews.com/opinion/letters/letter-holistic-plan-not-a-mine-needed-for-howe-sound-1.2353305">http://www.nsnews.com/opinion/letters/letter-holistic-plan-not-a-mine-needed-for-howe-sound-1.2353305</a>
2626	598 - 3	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	2. Please consider my different signed comments in Coast Reporter, page 9, September 30, 2016, headline "Deny Burnco mine".	Thank you for providing this article. I has been documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See link URL below:  <a href="http://www.coastreporter.net/opinion/letters/deny-burnco-mine-1.2354661">http://www.coastreporter.net/opinion/letters/deny-burnco-mine-1.2354661</a>
2627	598 - 4	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	3. Please consider the comments by Mr. Mark Lebbell et al in the Coast Reporter, September 30, 2016, page 11, headline "Directors debate Burnco submission". Mr. Lebbell, SCR D Director for Roberts Creek, is quoted that he "has yet to hear from any of his constituents who support the project".	Thank you for providing this article. I has been documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See link URL below:  <a href="http://www.coastreporter.net/news/local-news/directors-debate-burnco-submission-1.2354740">http://www.coastreporter.net/news/local-news/directors-debate-burnco-submission-1.2354740</a>
2628	598 - 5	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	4. Please consider my signed comments, following in this document, to Hon. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones, MP for West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country, October 2, 2016, and to Squamish Mayor Patricia Heintzman.	See additional comments contained in this submission listed below.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2629	598 - 6	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	5. Please make yourself familiar with Vince Beiser's disturbing and pertinent reporting on the mining of sand and gravel, supported by the Pulitzer Center on Crisis Reporting. It discusses how aggregate mining is disrupting sensitive ecosystems. Beiser's reporting has been widely praised by informed reviewers, and featured at length on the CBC (September 25, 2016 "The Sunday Edition".) Click on The Sunday Edition with Michael Enright for Sept 25, 2016.	Thank you for providing this article. I has been documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See link URL below:  <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/lethal-force-running-out-of-sand-helping-hoarders-hosanna-then-and-now-inside-butter-tarts-1.3770809/the-world-is-starting-to-run-out-of-sand-1.3770813">http://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/lethal-force-running-out-of-sand-helping-hoarders-hosanna-then-and-now-inside-butter-tarts-1.3770809/the-world-is-starting-to-run-out-of-sand-1.3770813</a>
2630	598 - 7	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6. Please also consider these additional comments:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2631	598 - 8	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6.1 Who will acquire and reclaim the exhausted Burnco site and make it, as Burnco slyly suggests with photos, video and texts on its various public websites and dog and pony shows, into another Quarry Park in Calgary? Fact: Quarry Park was acquired in 2005 by a development corporation; Burnco, which mined the site out, has had little, if anything, to do with its financing, engineering, development and upkeep. Worse, why does Burnco compare the Howe Sound mine site's possibilities to the results achieved at Queen Elizabeth Park in Vancouver and Butchart Gardens in Victoria? Burnco had nothing to do with these two projects, and they are in no way comparable to the Howe Sound property. Burnco has a long history of abandoning its exhausted mine sites.	A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until installed works are determined to be functioning as intended.  Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.
2632	598 - 9	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6.2 Burnco is aware of the international and national trends toward outlawing mining operations, particularly sand and gravel operations, near rivers and oceans. Is that why it is in such a hurry to exploit the unnecessary Howe Sound site? BC is currently mine-friendly, but with a provincial election coming up, and public protests over environmentally-damaging projects increasing, is this not to be considered an overriding "social" concern?	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2633	598 - 10	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6.3 Burnco has owned the Howe Sound mine site for almost a decade. Salmon have spawned on the property during that time, but not in the past two years. Has Burnco done anything to improve this situation? Is it not convenient to Burnco that it can state at this moment, despite a century of recorded salmon spawning there, that it not now a salmon-spawning property?	<p>BURNCO has historically supported the communities in which it operates in the form of sponsoring community events, raising money for charities and various forms of donation.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the existing fish compensation channel, BURNCO has been monitoring its effectiveness and conducting fisheries surveys throughout the property since acquiring the site in 2008.</p>
2634	598 - 11	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6.4 Burnco is a privately-held company and does not reveal its financial position or projections with regard to this property. However, even assigning a highly conservative \$10 a tonne average value for the mine's production of 16,000,000-20,000,000 tons of product over the next 20 years, compared to the mine's extremely low initial acquisition cost, low taxes, and the low plant, development and estimated operating costs over the same period, the return on investment will be remarkable. Are the low property taxes, concessionary mining taxes, and the negligible reclamation costs sufficient to offset the cost of environmental damage and related social costs that, inevitably, will be borne by the public? Will this be considered by economists and others trained to properly assess the data?	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2635	598 - 12	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	<p>6.5 What are Burnco's "proprietary" mining techniques that allegedly will reduce significantly the dust and other pollution created by the proposed mine. Will they be revealed adequately for assessment? ? The Howe Sound mine site and shipping routes are subject to extremely high winds (especially the infamous Squamish blowing down the Sound to Vancouver, great for extreme sailing, very bad for this kind of mining, product storage, port operations and shipping). Will you be told? It would appear that they are little more than lightly covered conveyor belts, the use of liquid dampening, and other unsophisticated applications.. The scoop and dredge operation is a crude mining technique, basically a small step up from pick and shovel. The scoop/ dredging equipment is primitive, cheap to source, and highly damaging to the environment.</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2636	598 - 13	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	<p>6.6. On September 8, the Woodfibre LNG property near Squamish had a serious waste water and leachate spill. There was an unacceptable delay in reporting this accident, according to Squamish Mayor Patricia Heintzman. Woodfibre LNG did not follow proper protocol, "and did not inform the District appropriately." Woodfibre LNG spokesperson's response: "The spill does underscore the challenges of managing a 100-year-old site." (Squamish chief, September 22, 2016)</p> <p>Subsequently, Woodfibre stated that it "has no legal requirement to inform" DOS for small incidents (Squamish Chief, September 22, 2016).</p> <p>This recent incident points out the ongoing inadequacies of reporting and monitoring of environmentally damaging incidents. The Howe Sound pulp mill has a long record of not reporting or underreporting serious incidents. Air quality, for example, is monitored primarily by a small, old, unmanned station on the Langdale elementary school grounds. Does it even matter? The objectionable smell from this plant continues, although promises of more and better monitoring stations that have been promised by government over the years have never been fulfilled. In situ monitoring by Fisheries, at the federal level, and by wildlife personnel from various levels of government, and other agencies charged with protection of the environment, are inadequate or non-existent.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2637	598 - 14	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	6.7. Bad faith industrial operations in Howe Sound have been the norm for more than a century. Governments, local, provincial and federal, have failed to provide the necessary monitoring of the land, air, water, and the social damage these activities have caused. They have failed to prosecute offenders in any meaningful way. Fines, rarely levied, are inconsequential to the offenders.	BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.  BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.  BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.
2638	598 - 15	Donald Townson	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound deserve environmental protection, and no further industrial activity should be allowed until adequate safeguards are in place, and certainly not before a holistic plan for the Sound is in place. The Burnco application provides no assurance that the legitimate public interest in proper environmental safeguards will be served.  An unnecessary aggregate mine and processing plant at its heart is pointless.	Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.  Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.  Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are: - Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures - Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering - Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat - Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals. - Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.  Examples of compensation or offset measure are: - Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2. - Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.
2639	599 - 1	Michael and Mildred Watson	Bowen Island, BC	My Husband and I are opposed to this project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2640	599 - 2	Michael and Mildred Watson	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound has finally recovered in a spectacular manner from many years of industrial pollution. Why then is there a desire to re-industrialise this most valuable area? To do so would be a negative step back in time.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2641	599 - 3	Michael and Mildred Watson	Bowen Island, BC	There is no need trade the local environment for a few jobs, particularly as the Sea to Sky area is already prospering and producing "clean" modern employment for so many people. Why put that at risk? Thank you for your consideration.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2642	600 - 1	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	<p>Thanks for taking the time to consider my opinion of Burnco's Proposed Aggregate Mine at McNab Creek in the Howe Sound.</p> <p>The Howe Sound whose head is on the southeast of the Strait of Georgia, and extends 42 kilometres to its head at Squamish with its beautiful network of fjords, is an amazing wilderness enjoyed by all locals and visitors alike, with unspoilt marine wildlife.</p> <p>At McNab Creek valley which is located in the middle of the Howe Sound, is where Burnco is proposing to develop a 74+ acre pit, build an onsite crushing and processing plant, and produce 20+ million tonnes of aggregate per year over 16 + years. The project will create only 12 direct jobs. To the:</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2643	600 - 2	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life that exist in the Howe Sound and at McNab Creek?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2644	600 - 3	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recreational crabbing, prawning, fishing, and natural oysters beds, among many other forms of wildlife that is enjoyed by all around this area?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2645	600 - 4	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over \$300 million that Burnco will profit from by having 12 employees on site? Will it, in the long term benefit of indirect and direct jobs within the recreation building and tourism markets due to negative effects of the mine? Or just Burnco?</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2646	600 - 5	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the numerous eagles nests that live in the McNab Creek area. Is it a benefit to their young that are protected under BC's laws and are sensitive to noise created by Burnco project?</li> <li>population of Roosevelt Elk that were transplanted to McNab Creek by the BC Ministry of Environment in the early 2000's?</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2647	600 - 6	Ian Heathcote	Not Stated	As you can see the benefit is clearly to Burnco. We need to speak for the future of all related to the Howe Sound Ecosystem and for those who cannot speak and act and ensure they protected and put a stop to the Burnco proposed aggregate mine at McNab Creek.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2648	601 - 1	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	I have attended open houses, presentations and reviewed the application on this Project. I appreciate that Burnco has done their utmost to mitigate risks towards a sustainable project. However, I believe that, cumulatively, the risks outweigh the benefits and cannot support the Project. I submit and concur with the specifics in the attached comments.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2649	601 - 2	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated  The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.  Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a>	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2650	601 - 3	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2651	601 - 4	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2652	601 - 5	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2653	601 - 6	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2654	601 - 7	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2655	601 - 8	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2656	601 - 9	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2657	601 - 10	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2658	601 - 11	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2659	601 - 12	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2660	601 - 13	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2661	601 - 14	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2662	601 - 15	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2663	601 - 16	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2664	601 - 17	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2665	601 - 18	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2666	601 - 19	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2667	601 - 20	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2668	601 - 21	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
2669	601 - 22	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2670	601 - 23	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2671	601 - 24	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
2672	601 - 25	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2673	601 - 26	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2674	601 - 27	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2675	601 - 28	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
2676	601 - 29	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2677	601 - 30	Star Morris	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2678	602 - 1	Chris Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I just wanted to voice my concern about the gravel mine that Burnco has proposed to put in beautiful Howe Sound. Howe Sound has inspired me in so many ways. It has been my childhood escape where I could just be a kid, playing with my friends in the forest or enjoying fishing on the dock in the early morning.</p> <p>I was so inspired in fact, that I made many movies there, capturing the glorious scenery. Little did I know that there were other people interested in the Howe Sound, and it was not people who necessarily aimed to make things better for the community in the area. When I heard about the mine, I was appalled and scared about the future of the community, not just the community of people, but the wildlife too.</p> <p>I decided to get my camera out once again and create a short 5 minute video, giving awareness about the nature of the place and the increasingly-real threat that looms over it. And I knew that there were mines there before. Britannia Mine being one of them. Britannia Mine, was one of the biggest polluters in Canada, harmed the Howe Sound immensely. Only now have the salmon and the dolphins come back. We do not want to make that same environmental mistake twice...and that was the drive for my video.</p> <p>That video published back in 2013 totally changed what I wanted to do with my life. I discovered throughout he making of the short, that I wanted to go into film and be the person who can share with the people, the natural beauty of the world. I enrolled in film school at</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2679	603 - 1	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	Please see attached document.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2680	603 - 2	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	Burnco proposes environmental degradation to a huge riparian area. Modification of the riparian zone including bank erosion, direct destruction from heavy equipment operation, discharges from equipment and refueling, reduction in groundwater elevations, impacts on structures and access, disturbance to flora and fauna and all life forms, impacts on coastal processes.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2681	603 - 3	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>The area encompasses many smaller streams which provide necessary nutrients to fish in the estuary. This project will wipe out a major feed source, which would harm or disturb lifeforms in the estuary. Increased sediment loads from the proposed new channels will be flowing to the estuary causing detrimental effect on marine lifeforms.</p> <p>To disturb the McNab Creek riparian area would be extremely harmful to all life forms in the estuary including fish in the Sound. This project will do more harm than good.</p> <p>As stated at Provincial site <a href="http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources">http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/agricultural-land-and-environment/water/riparian-areas/resources</a> "A riparian zone, or riparian area, is the interface between land and a river or stream. Although riparian areas make up only a small fraction of the land, they are among the most productive and valuable of all landscape types". Therefore, let's keep this most productive and valuable McNab Creek riparian area undisturbed.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2682	603 - 4	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2683	603 - 5	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2684	603 - 6	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2685	603 - 7	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2686	603 - 8	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
2687	603 - 9	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCR D said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2688	603 - 10	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2689	603 - 11	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2690	603 - 12	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2691	603 - 13	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2692	603 - 14	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2693	603 - 15	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2694	603 - 16	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2695	603 - 17	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2696	603 - 18	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2697	603 - 19	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2698	603 - 20	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2699	603 - 21	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2700	603 - 22	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2701	603 - 23	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
2702	603 - 24	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2703	603 - 25	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2704	603 - 26	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
2705	603 - 27	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2706	603 - 28	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2707	603 - 29	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2708	603 - 30	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
2709	603 - 31	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2710	603 - 32	Vel Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2711	604 - 1	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	I believe the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project should not be allowed to proceed based on a long list of items. They include the following:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2712	604 - 2	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health</p> <p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2713	604 - 3	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health</p> <p>Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2714	604 - 4	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2715	604 - 5	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Health Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2716	604 - 6	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Noise - The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application. The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis, will create Noise health effects. Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Health consequences of regular exposure, to consistent elevated sound levels, from the new noise generated by this facility, is known to cause hearing impairment, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, annoyance, and sleep disturbance.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2717	604 - 7	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Air Quality including dust - Dust and particulate matter generated from the crushing facility and mining operation will impact the health of residents of the Howe Sound region. These harmful allergens can trigger allergic reactions and asthma in many people. Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2718	604 - 8	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs. Siltation monitoring should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>
2719	604 - 9	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Economy Howe Sound directly contributes hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue from tourism, entertainment and commercial fishing industries. The Burnco Aggregate Mine Project will reduce this revenue significantly and not provide corresponding off setting revenue for the losses incurred.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2720	604 - 10	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2721	604 - 11	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The amount of noise generated by the crushing facility and mining operation on a consistent basis will lower the property value of homes located in the area including Lions Bay, Furry Creek, the proposed Porteau Cove housing development, Gambier Island, Anvil Island, Britania Mines and of course McNab Creek.	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2722	604 - 12	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Dust and particulate matter generated by the crushing facility and mining operation will increase health costs to BC Taxpayers.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential public health effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on human health assessed considered activities contributing to air emissions, deposition of particulate matter to terrestrial environments, and emission of substances to aquatic environments.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential health effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2723	604 - 13	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Wakes from commercial barge traffic will increase insurance claims and Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2724	604 - 14	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA and the analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model. BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered. If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
2725	604 - 15	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA and the analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model. BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered. If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.	The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.
2726	604 - 16	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Environment Ground water pollution from the mine will have a negative environmental impact on the region and in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2727	604 - 17	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	The mine will create risks to Wildlife Safety including impacting of rare birds and protected species and disturbance of terrestrial vegetation unique to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2728	604 - 18	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Loss of productive salmon habitat, that will be impacted negatively from mining a pristine estuary. The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2729	604 - 19	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Loss of productive salmon habitat, that will be impacted negatively from mining a pristine estuary. The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2730	604 - 20	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Marine resources such as killer whales, dolphins, crabs, and trout will all be negatively impacted from the noise and disturbance of the estuary.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2731	604 - 21	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Burnco's consultants documenting that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk, re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2732	604 - 22	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The McNab creek region is a known as a tourism and recreation area. Introducing a mining operation will severely impact and change the use of the region. The mine will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limit the recreational activities enjoyed on the water in front of the estuary</li> <li>• limit if not stop the fishing and crabbing opportunities on the water in front of the area</li> <li>• severely impact the recreational opportunities on Gambier Island directly across from the area</li> <li>• the increase commercial barge traffic will create a hazardous situation for boaters, recreational kayakers and children on the water from the surrounding commercial kids camps</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2733	604 - 23	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2734	604 - 24	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2735	604 - 25	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2736	604 - 26	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Also, the proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties and the McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2737	604 - 27	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Cultural</p> <p>There are several instances where historical first nations artifacts have been found in the region. Disturbing the estuary will limit, if not remove opportunities for archeological study.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Project to heritage resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 8.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>While archaeological field studies have been completed and no archaeological sites were recorded within the local study area (LSA), the area does retain potential to contain buried archaeological materials. If heritage resources are encountered, adverse effects mitigation would be facilitated through the implementation of a Heritage Resource Chance Find Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E - Section 16.0) to determine appropriate actions which would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- modify or stop any land-altering activities in the immediate vicinity;</li> <li>- notify the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation; and</li> <li>- determine an acceptable management strategy in consultation with the Archaeology Branch, the Skwxwwu7mesh (Squamish) First Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation.</li> </ul>
2738	604 - 28	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2739	604 - 29	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2740	604 - 30	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Howe Sound is a centre piece jewel for Sea to Sky and BC tourism, including the growing number of visitors to the Whistler area. Culturally BC has positioned tourism around nature and the unparalleled spectacular environment. The mine, which is visible from the highway and which will be heard from the eastern shores of Howe Sound limits the cultural tourism opportunities already established in the region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2741	604 - 31	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Other Heavy Industry Projects</p> <p>The Howe Sound region this is not an industrial area as Bunco describes. Previous or incumbent rights should not have precedent. Currently there are a large number of heavy industry based projects that are applying for approval in the Howe Sound area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Run of River at McNab Creek</li> <li>LNG at the former Woodfibre Site</li> <li>Garbage Incineration beside the Port Mellon Sawmill Squamish Port Expansion A Pipeline in the Squamish Watershed to bring gas for the LNG plant</li> <li>A possible bridge to the Sun Shine Coast from either Porteau Cove</li> </ul> <p>The Burnco project decision should take all projects listed into consideration when reviewing this application.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2742	604 - 32	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	<p>A Telling Tale</p> <p>Sometimes speaking with the applicant and their consultants reveals the type of neighbour the applicant will be. The following quotes were received at the Burnco Open House held in Horsehoe Bay, in September 2016, from Burnco and Burnco representatives:</p> <p>"It's my land and I'll do what I want with it." from Mr Burns, CEO of Burnco when he interrupted a private conversation about how the Burnco proposed gravel mine appears to be taking up the whole McNab Creek foreshore and encroaching on McNab Creek.</p> <p>"Royalties from the project will be paid to another Burnco company" from Mr Burns, CEO of Bunco when asked about the revenue BC taxpayers should expect to receive from the Bunco proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek.</p> <p>"I've never been to the Burnco proposed gravel mine site" Environmental consultant who was responsible for the Sound assessment and mitigation plan.</p> <p>In conclusion, I ask you, Is this the type of company BC Taxpayers, the BC Government, Governments surrounding Howe Sound, First Nations and Sea to Sky residents/property owners want to be doing business with?</p>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2743	604 - 33	Cheryl Wozny	Lions Bay, BC	Please reject the Burnco Aggregate Mine Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2744	605 - 1	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>We enclose a letter from LGL Limited who has undertaken an independent review of the Burnco Environmental Impact Study that has been submitted by Burnco in connection with its application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate.</p> <p>As you will see from the attached, the independent consultant has identified a number of deficiencies in the EAC application and concludes by saying, "it is our professional opinion that the BURNCO Aggregate Project EAC application did not effectively address potential adverse residual and cumulative effects to marine resources, recreational values and land management. We recommend that the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office, in its environmental assessment report, conclude that the project will cause significant environmental effects."</p> <p>We wholeheartedly agree with the consultant's conclusion that the Environmental Impact Study does not properly address the impacts that the proposed aggregate mine will have. We strongly urge the BC EAO to recommend that the application for approval of this proposed project be denied.</p>	BURNCO prepared a Technical Memo response to comments provided by the Future of Howe Sound Society in a letter to Ruth Simons (Executive Director) from LGL Limited dated September 27, 2016 titled Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project. See 10-Jan-2017 Technical Memo entitled 'Response to Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project'.
2745	606 - 1	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	I wish to register my strong objection to the Proposed BURNCO McNab Creek gravel pit.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2746	606 - 2	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	The damage done to the environment, and the costs to the recreation industry in the Howe Sound area outweigh the benefits this mine will bring to the economy.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2747	606 - 3	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	There is no shortage of gravel, present gravel sources can supply the demand for gravel. The McNab Creek gravel pit represents cheap gravel, if the costs to others is not calculated in the equation.	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
2748	606 - 4	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	The application has been denied before. The situation has not changed. It should be denied again.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2749	606 - 5	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	I attach a tabulated list of problems with the new application that have not been addressed properly by the project proponent.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2750	606 - 6	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2751	606 - 7	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2752	606 - 8	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
2753	606 - 9	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2754	606 - 10	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
2755	606 - 11	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCR D said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2756	606 - 12	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
2757	606 - 13	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2758	606 - 14	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
2759	606 - 15	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2760	606 - 16	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
2761	606 - 17	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2762	606 - 18	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2763	606 - 19	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2764	606 - 20	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2765	606 - 21	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2766	606 - 22	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
2767	606 - 23	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean) , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
2768	606 - 24	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2769	606 - 25	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
2770	606 - 26	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
2771	606 - 27	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2772	606 - 28	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
2773	606 - 29	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2774	606 - 30	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2775	606 - 31	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2776	606 - 32	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
2777	606 - 33	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2778	606 - 34	Peter Kowalczyk	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2779	607 - 1	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2780	607 - 2	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2781	607 - 3	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2782	607 - 4	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2783	607 - 5	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2784	607 - 6	Albert Roos	North Vancouver, BC	As a frequent boater on Howe Sound for the past 20 years, I have seen enormous improvements in the Sound's marine wildlife population. Where once it appeared nearly "dead", whales are now frequently seen, as are Pacific White Sided Dolphins. Recreational fishing has rebounded. The McNab Creek estuary is a vital part of the marine ecosystem in this area. Burnco's proposed gravel pit site is ludicrous. On a simple cost vs. benefit analysis, we have a gravel operation employing a few people on the one hand vs. the health of a major recreational area and tourist attraction located minutes from a metropolitan area of almost 3 million people (and growing). We have one chance to make the correct decision. Burnco's application should be denied.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
2785	608 - 1	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	I do not want this mine in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2786	608 - 2	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	McNab Creek is normally a quiet area of the Sound - a significant reason why the strata owners at McNab and many others live thereabouts. The Burnco mine operation will be noisy- how noisy is clearly documented in the attached study of aggregate mines by the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), which shows typical noise levels exceeding 100dba in the immediate vicinity of such facilities. This noise level is not only unacceptable in such an area, it is highly annoying to local receptors and can cause permanent hearing loss in mine workers. As the valley topography will amplify the sound, I think a far more detailed assessment of probable noise and its damage to the quiet enjoyment of the area be done before any permits are considered for this operation.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p> <p>Site and activity specific Health and Safety Plans will outline specific procedures and protocols for working around active construction sites. BURNCO's corporate Health, Safety and Environment (HSE) Management Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G, Section 22, Appendix 16-B of th EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2787	609 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	New Westminster, BC	This is absurd project the and should not be allowed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2788	610 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	Page 4-33 states: that "no announcement from MFLNRO has yet been made with respect to the cumulative effects framework implementation in Howe Sound". See attached announcement from the Province of BC May 26, 2015.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2789	611 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Ontario	This mine should not be built in or near an estuary.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2790	611 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Ontario	This mine should not be built in or near an estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2791	612 - 1	James Askey	West Vancouver, BC	I am very strongly opposed to this Burnco application.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2792	612 - 2	James Askey	West Vancouver, BC	It will be destructive to the watershed, Howe Sound marine life and to the delicate balance of flora and fauna on the current lands.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2793	612 - 3	James Askey	West Vancouver, BC	It also employs only a small number of low paid workers, with profits going out of province. Please do not approve this proposal.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2794	612 - 4	James Askey	West Vancouver, BC	It also employs only a small number of low paid workers, with profits going out of province. Please do not approve this proposal.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2795	613 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Oshawa, ON	I call on you to take action today and stand with the communities and municipalities around the Sound who say NO to Woodfibre LNG and increased greenhouse gas emissions into the airshed.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.</p>
2796	614 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Salmon returns in BC hit an all time low in 2016. As water temperatures warm to dangerous levels, the BCEAO must take a proactive approach and ensure Proponents include current data and analysis of the effects of climate change on fish/habitat as part of the Environmental Assessment process. Projects such as this, which will negatively impact fish/habitat in the short, medium and/or long-term, should not be approved.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2797	614 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Water quality is insufficiently characterized in the application. Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs. The project should not be approved until the proponent can show that siltation will not cause harm to fish/habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2798	614 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	As gravel is extracted from the ground, fresh water from the estuary would flow into the pit. and change the hydraulic nature of the land, resulting in saltwater seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. Saltwater in the estuary and creek could kill a variety of salmon and plants. This project should not be approved before thorough hydrological studies have been done, over several years, and this issue has been adequately addressed.	The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.
2799	614 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk. For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible. Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat.	The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.  Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.
2800	614 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. It would have very serious impacts on residents and property owners in West Howe Sound and on Gambier Island. Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs. The application utterly fails to address impacts on residents, property owners and local amenities.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2801	614 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. It would have very serious impacts on residents and property owners in West Howe Sound and on Gambier Island. Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs. The application utterly fails to address impacts on residents, property owners and local amenities.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2802	614 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. It would have very serious impacts on residents and property owners in West Howe Sound and on Gambier Island. Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs. The application utterly fails to address impacts on residents, property owners and local amenities.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2803	614 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Barge traffic would diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of proposed LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent. A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2804	615 - 1	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	I am writing to state my strong opposition to the proposed gravel pit mine in McNab Creek.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2805	615 - 2	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	First of all- aggregate is a non-renewable resource. For the sake of sustainability, we should as humans immediately stop and realize the long term impact of our choices with regards to the environment, quality of life and our use of non-renewables. Will more roads and traffic really increase our quality of life? No. How sustainable is it to keep going after non-renewables? Especially in such an area as Howe Sound.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2806	615 - 3	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	In regards to use of fossil fuel- Burnco argues for the use of barges to transport the gravel so it isn't traveling on the roads... But what happens once the barge lands?? It will go onto trucks! Just because it isn't loaded onto trucks immediately- does not mean its impact and use of fossil fuel will be less. Why isn't this more long term travel of the gravel taken into account for impact to the environment?	<p>The incremental change in tug/barge traffic of associated with the Proposed Project is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 0% net change from south of Passage Island, along the Strait of Georgia, to the North and South Arms of the Fraser River; and</li> <li>▪ 0% net change along the Fraser River to the load-out facilities in Burnaby and Langley.</li> </ul> <p>There is therefore no additional truck traffic associated with unloading gravel from with the Proposed Project.</p>
2807	615 - 4	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	The barges themselves will impact the water on which is travels. What happens if it spills into the ocean?	<p>Potential effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events have been assessed. The following potential accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events – and associated mitigation - are presented in Volume 3, Part G – Section 15.4.1 of the EAC Application/EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geohazards: Earthquake-related ground movements and land-based mass movements;</li> <li>- Power outages;</li> <li>- Accidental discharge of sediment or fines into watercourses;</li> <li>- Accidental hazardous material spills – Land and marine based; and</li> <li>- Vessel and barge accidents (e.g., barge capsizing). – Aggregate spills.</li> </ul> <p>Project residual effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2808	615 - 5	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	The gravel pit mine will have a negative impact on tourism. Howe Sound is a beautiful place, which would should be considered a national park. We should strive to protect it instead of re-industrializing it. Which brings me to one of Burncos main arguments: that the area isn't pristine and has had previous damage. And the point is..?? Just because a certain piece of land isn't pristine, does not give a good excuse to develop it. McNab creek is home to salmon, elk, bears, and fish and animals of all sorts. Let them be. Rearrange things to accommodate for the impact this mine will have isn't better" than what's natural there; man made isn't better then how things are natural formed...	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2809	615 - 6	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is recovering from previous industry. To re-industrialize this area is backwards thinking and inexcusable. This 77 acre pit is one of only three River estuaries in this area. Seems ludicrous to destroy it without a long term land and water use plan.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2810	615 - 7	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	The project will limit access to the shore for animals that frequent the area to forage. Will you call them on their cell phone to tell them the new path?! Sure, they excuse providing new habitat for that they are killing but new isn't necessarily better.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered included barriers to movement. Proposed mitigation includes maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers and installing amphibian passageways, where appropriate. Following the application of proposed mitigation, potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2811	615 - 8	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	The change in water patterns will negatively fresh water habitat. There is risk to salmon habitat and the other fish of the area is not worth taking.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2812	615 - 9	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	McNab creek is home to 21 species at risk including the Roosevelt Elk who were re-introduced to the area just 15 years ago!!! Talk about confusing the animals!	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2813	615 - 10	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	Noise- this will impact all in the area including fish and animals, tourist and locals. It will negatively impact and confuse underwater creatures.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2814	615 - 11	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	Noise- this will impact all in the area including fish and animals, tourist and locals. It will negatively impact and confuse underwater creatures.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2815	615 - 12	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	Noise- this will impact all in the area including fish and animals, tourist and locals. It will negatively impact and confuse underwater creatures.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2816	615 - 13	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	The vibration of the electric clamshell will be bad for the marine life.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2817	615 - 14	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	Light pollution- how nice it is to drive along the sea to sky and not be blinded by lights from buildings and such. We need the night sky and the impact of lights to this area will absolutely destroy this!! We need to see the stars. Already, this is getting more difficult. When is enough, enough!!!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2818	615 - 15	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	This project will also be an eyesore to the many camps in the areas. Is setting up a gravel pit mine that will be surrounded by numerous kids camps really what we want to teach our kids?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation effects - including youth camps - are considered in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2819	615 - 16	Thomasina Pidgeon	Squamish, BC	At the open house I saw that Burnco made adjustments for damage that will be done but this isn't enough. This area is too beautiful for a gravel pit mine. Further investing in the fossil fuel industry (gravel for roads..) is NOT sustainable. We need to change our ways and immediately stop this destructive path we are on and find new, improved and sustainable ways of living which will not have such adverse effects to that which we love. Howe Sound.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2820	616 - 1	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	Please find attached letter from Islands Trust Council Chair Peter Luckham. Re: Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement / Application for the Proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project I am writing on behalf of the Islands Trust Council regarding the proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project. I understand you will also be receiving a separate submission from the Gambier Island Local Trust Committee. We are limiting our comments to the marine aspects of the project which are within our jurisdiction.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2821	616 - 2	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	We appreciate that the EAO invited Islands Trust and Bowen Island Municipality staff and elected officials to participate in the Advisory Working Group. We also appreciate that the EAO held information sessions in September in Squamish, West Vancouver and Gibsons.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2822	616 - 3	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	We have heard from constituents that they would appreciate more time to comment on this application that could have lasting implications for the culture, environment, and economy of Howe Sound communities.	The formal Public Comment Period was extended by 5 days (to October 3, 2016) to accommodate those who required more time to comment on the EAC Application/EIS.
2823	616 - 4	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	In our Policy Statement the Islands Trust Council holds that economic opportunities should be compatible with the conservation of resources and protection of community character. For years now, we have heard constituents express a clear desire for governments at all levels to support Howe Sound's ongoing transition from a polluted industrial zone to a thriving environment that supports sustainable businesses, including a world-class tourism industry. The proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project is not compatible with that vision or with the community character of Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2824	616 - 5	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	I understand that at this point of the environmental assessment process you are seeking feedback on the project and its potential to cause environmental, heritage, health, social, and economic effects. With regard to the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project application, we have heard strong concerns in our communities on the topics listed below. While I provide suggestions below about potential project conditions, this should in no way be interpreted as Trust Council's endorsement of conditional approval of the project.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2825	616 - 6	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	- That the EAO be cautious in approving any new industrial projects, including the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project, until there is a better understanding of the cumulative effects of existing and approved projects in Howe Sound. Stakeholders in the region are still awaiting results of the Ministry of Forest, Land and Natural Resource Operations cumulative effects assessment and monitoring project for the Howe Sound area. In the absence of critical knowledge regarding cumulative effects within Howe Sound, we encourage the EAO to take a precautionary approach.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2826	616 - 7	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	- That industrial noises from the Project are not compatible with the peaceful, quiet enjoyment of nature that residents and visitors treasure in Howe Sound. There are concerns that the application does not sufficiently address the impacts of noise across water on residents of Gambier Island and recreational boaters who may be at anchor.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
2827	616 - 8	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	o Suggested condition: The EAO should require the proponent to undertake the four-month construction phase between October and April when there are fewer recreational visitors in Howe Sound.	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.  BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
2828	616 - 9	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	o Suggestion condition: Barge loading activity should limited to 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays (no loading on weekends or statutory holidays). We've heard that 7 a.m. in the summertime is too early for a region known as a relaxing recreational destination.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, , with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.  BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
2829	616 - 10	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	- That the application did not provide sufficient information on: o ecological baseline to support conclusions that the Project would not have significant effects in the marine environment during its 16 years of operation.	The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with: - BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013), - Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007), - Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994), - Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and - A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).  A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2830	616 - 11	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	o projected sea level rise (combined with predicted storms surges and periodic king tides) to support conclusions that the Project would not cause significant effects to the environment after 2035.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential effects of future sea-level rise are addressed in Section 5.8.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted RSP2100 (sea-level height by 2100 relative to 2007 levels) using the mean sea-level rise was 18 cm, with a possible range of 6 to 30 cm. The predicted RSL2100 using the high predicted sea-level rise was 88 cm, with a possible range of 57 to 118 cm.</p> <p>Since the Proposed Project is expected to be completed by 2035 it is expected that rising sea levels of this amount will have little direct impact on the Proposed Project operation phase. The Proposed Project closure plan consists of removing surface infrastructure and site reclamation including a ground and surface water-fed lake (the pit lake), and therefore it is expected that the predicted rising sea level will have little impact on Proposed Project closure.</p>
2831	616 - 12	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	o the potential for dust during loading of barges and during barge transport to determine potential impacts to the marine environment, marine users and island residents	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for fugitive barge emissions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barges will only be travelling loaded in one direction;</li> <li>- The barges will have 2.74 m boxwalls which will act as partial windscreens;</li> <li>- The loaded aggregate material will be wet; and</li> <li>- Five of the seven aggregate types will have material silt content less than 1.5%.</li> </ul> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2832	616 - 13	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	- That a spill from the site could contaminate the marine environment.	<p>Potential effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events have been assessed. The following potential accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events – and associated mitigation - are presented in Volume 3, Part G – Section 15.4.1 of the EAC Application/EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geohazards: Earthquake-related ground movements and land-based mass movements;</li> <li>- Power outages;</li> <li>- Accidental discharge of sediment or fines into watercourses;</li> <li>- Accidental hazardous material spills – Land and marine based; and</li> <li>- Vessel and barge accidents (e.g., barge capsizing). – Aggregate spills.</li> </ul> <p>Project residual effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2833	616 - 14	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>o Suggested condition: Requirement for the proponent's Spill Prevention and Emergency Response plan to include a staff person with spill-response training on-site at all times during the life of the project in order to respond to and mitigate the effects of a chemical or hydrocarbon spill.</p>	<p>BURNCO plans to have a caretaker onsite to respond to any issues that may arise. Since the project is primarily electric powered, there are very few potential sources of hydrocarbons. The hydraulic fluid would be biodegradable such as Mobil EAL™ Hydraulic Oil 32 and 46 or equivalent.</p> <p>Potential impacts on surface water quality from possible fuel spills will be mitigated through the implementation of task-specific Materials Storage, Handling and Waste Management Plan(s) (MSHWMP) and a site-specific Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan(s) (SPERP; details provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16.0). An environmental monitor will monitor the implementation and performance of the material handling, spill prevention and emergency response plans. Operational water quality monitoring will be undertaken according to permit requirements.</p> <p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p>
2834	616 - 15	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>- That there should be on-going formal opportunities for regional stakeholders to provide feedback to BURNCO on impacts related to the project.</p> <p>o Suggested condition: Require BURNCO to fund a residents committee that includes at least two Gambier Island Local Trust Area residents that would offer an opportunity to meet at least twice a year to discuss issues related to the Project.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p> <p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p>
2835	616 - 16	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>The Islands Trust Policy Statement, a statutory document founded in extensive community consultation and approved in 1994 by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, contains policies that should be taken into account by the BC Environmental Assessment Office:</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway. The Islands Trust is represented on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2836	616 - 17	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>3.1.6 Trust Council encourages all government agencies and non-government organizations to consider both monetary and non-monetary costs when making resource management and land use decisions.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2837	616 - 18	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>3.1.9 Trust Council encourages actions and programs of other government agencies which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- place priority on the side of protection for Trust Area ecosystems when judgment must be exercised,</li> <li>- protect the diversity of native species and habitats in the Trust Area, and</li> <li>- prevent pollution of the air, land and fresh and marine waters of the Trust Area.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2838	616 - 19	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	3.1.10 Trust Council encourages the Provincial government to enforce standards for control of emissions polluting the air of the Trust Area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2839	616 - 20	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	3.1.11 Trust Council encourages agents of the government of British Columbia or the government of Canada, Crown corporations, municipalities, regional districts, non-government organizations, property owners and occupiers to protect environmentally sensitive areas and significant natural sites, features and landforms through voluntary stewardship, acquisitions, conservation covenants and careful management.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2840	616 - 21	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	4.5.3 It is the position of Trust Council that development, activity, buildings or structures should not result in a loss of significant marine or coastal habitat, or interfere with natural coastal processes.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2841	616 - 22	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	4.5.4 It is the position of Trust Council that development, activity, buildings or structures should not restrict public access to, from or along the marine shoreline.	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>
2842	616 - 23	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	4.5.5 It is Trust Council's policy that development should be directed to sites away from: - areas of environmental sensitivity, and - areas of naturally occurring stocks of clams or oysters.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2843	616 - 24	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>5.1.1 Trust Council holds that the overall visual quality of the Trust Area and its scenic values should be protected from disturbance, particularly those areas that have distinctive features or are highly visible.</p> <p>5.1.2 It is Trust Council's policy that the intensity of noise and lighting in and through the Trust Area should be compatible with community character.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2844	616 - 25	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>5.1.2 It is Trust Council's policy that the intensity of noise and lighting in and through the Trust Area should be compatible with community character.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
2845	616 - 26	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	<p>5.3.8 Trust Council encourages Provincial and Federal agencies to ensure safe shipment of materials hazardous to the environment.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2846	616 - 27	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	5.7.1 Trust Council holds that economic opportunities should be compatible with the conservation of resources and protection of community character.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2847	616 - 28	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	In light of the Islands Trust's mandate and the concerns from community members on the content of the application we hope the EAO will carefully consider all aspects of environmental, economic, social and cultural impacts on the Howe Sound communities throughout the process.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2848	616 - 29	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	Although we copy First Nations on all correspondence such as this, we have not heard their positions of the Proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project. Given our commitment to establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship with First Nations, we offer the Islands Trust position while being ready to respectfully consider their positions, as they become known.	<p>Potential effects on Aboriginal Interest, including current use, are presented in Part C of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal interests were assessed for the following Aboriginal Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Squamish Nation</li> <li>- Tseil-Waututh Nation</li> <li>- Musqueam Indian Band</li> <li>- Stz'uminus First Nation</li> <li>- Cowichan Tribes</li> <li>- Lyackson First Nation</li> <li>- Penelakut Tribe</li> <li>- Metis Nation British Columbia</li> </ul> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal rights, including current use of lands and resources, were identified for the Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation. Mitigation proposed is designed to address these potential effects.</p> <p>Both of these groups are participating in the EA review as members of the Technical Working Group.</p> <p>BURNCO is engaged in ongoing discussions on the Proposed Project with the Squamish Nation and the Tselil-Waututh Nation about commitments and processes for addressing their specific concerns, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access management for marine and terrestrial harvesting activities</li> <li>- marine use planning</li> <li>- ongoing involvement in environmental management and monitoring activities, and</li> <li>- ensuring the long-term ecological function of McNab Creek.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2849	616 - 30	Islands Trust	Victoria, BC	The Islands Trust Council is a federation of local government bodies representing 25,000 people living within the Islands Trust Area. The Islands Trust is responsible for preserving and protecting the unique environment and amenities of the Islands Trust Area through planning and regulating land use, development management, education, cooperation with other agencies, and land conservation. The area covers the islands and waters between the British Columbia mainland and southern Vancouver Island. It includes 13 major and more than 450 smaller islands covering 5200 square kilometres. On behalf of the Islands Trust Council, thank you for accepting this submission.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2850	617 - 1	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	My husband and I live directly on Howe Sound. Any commercial enterprise that will compromise our recovering environmental treasure is pure short-term insanity. I strongly oppose the Burnco Aggregate Project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2851	617 - 2	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	Howe Sound should be designated a National Park.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2852	617 - 3	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	Our Howe Sound environment is just recovering, with whales, stellar sea lions, and dophins returning.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2853	617 - 4	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	This is a tourist attraction from the entire lower mainland.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2854	617 - 5	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	A gravel pit with it's increased ship traffic and tailings that would endanger salmon and other species should definitely be OFF the table if the Liberal Government on both the Provincial and Federal levels cares about the environment like it says that it does.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2855	617 - 6	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	A gravel pit with it's increased ship traffic and tailings that would endanger salmon and other species should definitely be OFF the table if the Liberal Government on both the Provincial and Federal levels cares about the environment like it says that it does.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2856	617 - 7	Drs. Karen and Brian Funt	West Vancouver, BC	A gravel pit with it's increased ship traffic and tailings that would endanger salmon and other species should definitely be OFF the table if the Liberal Government on both the Provincial and Federal levels cares about the environment like it says that it does.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2857	618 - 1	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	Further to BURNCO Rock Products Ltd.'s application for an environmental assessment certificate for an aggregate project in the McNab Valley, West Howe Sound, The SCRDC considered the application at two Regular Board meetings (September 8, 2016 and September 22, 2016). The Board adopted resolutions that included the following submission regarding the application:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2858	618 - 2	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan needs to be implemented at the outset of the project to allow for mature vegetation cover and for adjustments to be made to ensure the plan functions as expected;	BURNCO has committed to constructing the habitat offset channel extension prior to construction of the Project and effects to the existing groundwater fed channel.
2859	618 - 3	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. Sufficient funds should be set aside by BURNCO to allow for long term maintenance of the new stream and related infrastructure, such as the overflow gate and a channel from the pit lake, to ensure the plan functions as expected and to include a contingency plan to be followed if the compensation plan fails.	Agreed, BURNCO expects that the provision of a letter of credit covering monitoring, construction and maintenance of any habitat offsetting will be required under the fisheries protection provisions of the Fisheries Act.
2860	618 - 4	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. Designs of the aggregate processing and storage area must include elements to mitigate any negative impact due to sediment runoff into Harlequin Creek and Watercourse 5.	It is recognized that surface run off control is a key aspect to the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) which is included in Part G, Section 22, Appendix 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Harlequin Creek and WC5 are identified as critical areas within the ESCP; control measures are proposed for construction, operations and closure phases of the Project.  As the surficial soils are highly permeable, we do not anticipate a high volume of surface runoff. The primary approach to storm water management is collection and infiltration. No point source discharges of surface water are proposed. Revegetation, vegetation covers, geotextile matting, resurfacing and water course armouring will be primary control measure. In addition, reclamation (revegetation) will occur in a progressive matter. Silt fencing is proposed as needed for temporary sediment control.
2861	618 - 5	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. If a new federal legislative criteria for negative impacts to fish habitat due to artificial lighting become applicable during the life of the project then impacts from artificial lighting need to be re-evaluated and updated mitigation measures applied.	If new federal government legislative criteria for negative impacts to fish habitat due to artificial lighting becomes applicable, then mitigation measures with respect to managing artificial lighting will be based on the most current legislation.
2862	618 - 6	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	v. If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to fish habitat becomes applicable during the life of the project then impacts from noise generating activity need to be re-evaluated and updated mitigation measures applied;	If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to fish habitat becomes applicable during the Project, then mitigation measures with respect to managing acoustic noise emissions will be based on the most current legislation.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2863	618 - 7	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vi. BURNCO should evaluate the impacts of climate change, and specifically sea level rise. In the post closure phase of the project and factor into the analysis the cumulative effects of periodic king tides and storm surges on the maximum of the range of high predicted sea level rise.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential effects of future sea-level rise are addressed in Section 5.8.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted RSP2100 (sea-level height by 2100 relative to 2007 levels) using the mean sea-level rise was 18 cm, with a possible range of 6 to 30 cm. The predicted RSL2100 using the high predicted sea-level rise was 88 cm, with a possible range of 57 to 118 cm.</p> <p>Since the Proposed Project is expected to be completed by 2035 it is expected that rising sea levels of this amount will have little direct impact on the Proposed Project operation phase. The Proposed Project closure plan consists of removing surface infrastructure and site reclamation including a ground and surface water-fed lake (the pit lake), and therefore it is expected that the predicted rising sea level will have little impact on Proposed Project closure.</p>
2864	618 - 8	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. The impact on salmonids of contaminants in the water column due to disturbance of sediment needs to be assessed;	<p>Project activities with potential to result in re-suspension of sediments as a result of seafloor disturbance are limited to the following: pile installation, vessel propeller scour, and vessel wake wash. The impacts of altered water quality (including increased contaminant exposure) on salmonids as a result of seabed disturbance and subsequent sediment resuspension from the above listed activities has been assessed under Vol. 2 of the EAC Application (refer to Section 5.2.5.2.1.1, Section 5.2.5.2.3.1, Section 5.2.5.4.1.1 and Section 5.2.5.4.1.3). Mitigation measures that will be implemented to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects associated with sediment disturbance are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1 and Table 5.2-18 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2865	618 - 9	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. More thorough studies and surveys should be completed on glass sponge reef presence within 200m of any part of the project area, and along any loaded barge transit routes, during the life of the project;	Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.
2866	618 - 10	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. The possible presence and impact on Northern Abalone, a species at risk, needs to be assessed;	As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed intertidal and subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic dive surveys in the marine environment using DFO-certified abalone biologists. The field surveys concluded that no abalone or abalone habitat were present in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint, as indicated in Section 5.2.5.5.1.2 of the EAC Application. Potential adverse impacts of the Project on abalone and abalone habitat were therefore considered to be negligible – not significant (Table 5.2-25).
2867	618 - 11	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals, or marine birds, becomes applicable during the life of the project then impacts of noise generating activity need to be re-evaluated and updated mitigation measures applied;	If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals or marine birds becomes applicable during the construction phase of the Project, then mitigation measures with respect to managing acoustic noise emissions will be based on the most current legislation.
2868	618 - 12	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	v. Vessel operators should receive an appropriate amount of training on how to avoid impact with marine mammals, as part of overall environmental related training, and records need to be kept of any incidents.	Mitigation measures applicable to vessel operators to avoid and/or minimize potential physical interactions between vessels and marine mammals are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. This includes methods in how to avoid ship strikes on marine mammals. Vessel operators will be required to record any potential incidents involving a marine mammal strike.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2869	618 - 13	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vi. An on-site 24 hour/seven days a week attendant should be required during the life of the project in order to respond to and mitigate the effects of a chemical or hydrocarbon spill.	BURNCO plans to have a caretaker onsite to respond to any issues that may arise. Since the project is primarily electric powered, there are very few potential sources of hydrocarbons. The hydraulic fluid would be biodegradable such as Mobil EAL™ Hydraulic Oil 32 and 46 or equivalent.  Potential impacts on surface water quality from possible fuel spills will be mitigated through the implementation of task-specific Materials Storage, Handling and Waste Management Plan(s) (MSHWMP) and a site-specific Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan(s) (SPERP; details provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16.0). An environmental monitor will monitor the implementation and performance of the material handling, spill prevention and emergency response plans. Operational water quality monitoring will be undertaken according to permit requirements.
2870	618 - 14	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vii. The proponent should be encouraged to engage in and be an active and ongoing contributor to the BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources Operations process to develop a Cumulative Effects Assessment Framework and the Squamish Nation Marine Environmental Plan.	As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.  BURNCO is committed to supporting the Squamish Nation's Marine Environmental Planning process.
2871	618 - 15	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. Consideration to reclamation of other portions of BURNCO's property should be set out as a means of identifying potential offset areas to mitigate negative impacts, such as the loss of land to the pit lake, and provide habitat enhancements.	The Proposed Project footprint was sited in an area with a long history of anthropogenic disturbance to minimize impacts to undisturbed habitat (including mature forest) and to generally minimize adverse effects on terrestrial resources. A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan will be developed and will outline the goals associated with wildlife habitat restoration, methods of rehabilitating wildlife habitat, and parameters to gauge the success of reclamation. Habitat reclamation will occur progressively over the life of the Proposed Project to return habitat to a functional capability for supporting wildlife as soon as possible. A detailed wildlife mitigation and monitoring plan has not yet been developed but will be developed as part of the Wildlife Management (Protection) Plan to minimize impacts on terrestrial resources and to collect data that will help evaluate the effectiveness of implemented mitigations.
2872	618 - 16	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. Regarding amphibian habitat replacement, the proposed pond within the BC Hydro right-of-way should be relocated so it is not impacted by maintenance of the right-of-way.	BURNCO is working with FLNRO and DFO on the suitable locations of proposed new amphibian ponds. The current location is not anticipated to affect routine maintenance of the existing transmission line. The existing access road will remain in place.
2873	618 - 17	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. Air quality monitoring stations should be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern part of Gambier Island, and in a location along the Sea to Sky corridor, for the life of the project and these monitoring stations should be established at the outset of the project in order to establish meaningful baseline information;	Air quality monitoring will begin prior to the Project operations.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EAC the Project Proponent has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7.  The predicted air quality concentrations as a result of the Proposed Project, in combination with existing levels were predicted to be well below the relevant air quality criteria at Gambier Island (Ekins Point) and along the Sea to Sky Corridor.
2874	618 - 18	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. Information from the air quality monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Air quality monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2875	618 - 19	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address air quality problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	The comment is noted.  In addition to conditions stipulated in the Environmental Assessment Certificate, relevant permitting will also be undertaken following receipt of an Environmental Assessment Certificate.
2876	618 - 20	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. Aggregate composition tests need to be done to ensure that harmful chemicals are not released during processing.	The project related release of metals within particulate matter to the air (that was used in the human health risk assessment) was based on site specific testing of the aggregate. No significant effects to public health were predicted (Volume 2, Part B, Section 9.1).
2877	618 - 21	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. Noise monitoring stations need to be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern area of Gambier Island for the life of the project;	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.
2878	618 - 22	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. Information from the noise monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Details of processing the noise monitoring results will be determined in the Noise Management Plan. Noise monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.
2879	618 - 23	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address noise problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	Measures for mitigating potential noise effects are presented in Table 18-1 of the EAC Application/EIS. A Noise Management Plan will be developed, which will include a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners. BURNCO will establish a mutually agreeable mechanism for engaging with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of benefit or concern.
2880	618 - 24	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. Site operations shall be consistent with Sunshine Coast Regional District Noise Control Bylaw No. 597, 2008.	Operations will be restricted to 7 AM to 9 PM, consistent with the SCRD Noise Control Bylaw section regarding Machine Noise.
2881	618 - 25	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	v. The design of noise mitigation berms, especially on the north side of the site, should pay particular attention to the topographical amplifications of the McNab Valley and its surrounding steep and mountainous terrain.	The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project considered the design of the proposed berms and accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.
2882	618 - 26	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vi. Consideration should be given that the four month construction phase be completed within the period of time when McNab Creek residential properties, recreational activities and facilities on North Gambier are less frequently used. Construction in the late fall to early spring timeframe may be more prudent to reduce impacts.	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Ekins Point.
2883	618 - 27	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. The SCRD supports BURNCO'S commitment to local hiring and procurement;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.
2884	618 - 28	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. The SCRD supports BURNCO'S commitment to reaching a benefit agreement with the McNab Strata community;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2885	618 - 29	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. Marine tourism activities should be incorporated into the Access Management Plan.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will have relevant information for all marine vessels, including marine tourism vessels, and for operators of tourism facilities that have a marine component, such as summer camps.
2886	618 - 30	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. Should the project proceed the SCRD wishes to enter into a discussion with BURNCO regarding a mutually acceptable community benefits agreement.	BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
2887	618 - 31	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. Recreational access to existing anchorages in the area need to be maintained;	Anchorage by Project and non-project vessels within the Project's marine control zone will be subject to the direction and specifications of the Marine Transport Management Plan, and this document will incorporate Transport Canada requirements and reflect Navigation Protection Program permitting (which the Proposed Project is subject to).
2888	618 - 32	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. Adequate safety lighting needs to be installed on marine facilities.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will specify aids and navigational lights as per Project planning and the Navigation Protection Program permitting process. The navigational aids and lights specified in this plan will be installed and maintained.
2889	618 - 33	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. The SCRD Lighting Guidelines must be followed for the lifetime of the project.	Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.
2890	618 - 34	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. Post-closure maintenance of the lake outflow supported by sufficient bonding should be a condition of the environmental assessment certificate.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.  Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.  Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2891	618 - 35	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ii. BURNCO needs to provide clarification of the impacts of the well on surface water is needed.	As presented in Section 5.6.5.2.1.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, the well will be pumped at a daily rate of 160 m <sup>3</sup> /day during operations. Although groundwater flow will be affected near to the well, which will be installed near the wash plant, it represents less than 0.3 % of the total groundwater flow through the valley deposits and as such will have negligible effect to overall groundwater flow. The specific well design is not complete but will meet the requirements of the 2016 Groundwater Protection Regulation (part of the Water Sustainability Act brought into force in February 2016).
2892	618 - 36	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iii. BURNCO's commitment to monitoring site conditions for groundwater and surface water and to recalibrate the model as the project progresses needs to be a condition of the environmental certificate. This should also include making this information public.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental certification.  A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include: - Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations. - During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope. - The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.  BURNCO will develop a project-specific website that will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed regarding the Project, including project schedule, construction activities, operating information, and noise and air quality monitoring data.
2893	618 - 37	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	iv. The sediment and erosion prevention measures need to be documented in a mitigation plan need to be provided for review.	Suspended sediment sampling will be conducted in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan for the Project. A site-specific erosion and sediment control plan has been developed for each Project phase (please see Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 3). Weekly inspections by a qualified environmental monitor will be conducted during periods when ground disturbance activities are being undertaken. Inspections will include a description of pre-site activity conditions, implementation of erosion and sediment control measures, monitoring of control measures, and records of visual observations. Additional event-based inspections, in response to expected storm events or heavy rain events, will also be undertaken to inspect erosion control measurements according to the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan (see Section 7.0). Monitoring will be conducted immediately upstream and downstream of disturbed areas in order to compare potential sediment inputs against background levels. These inspections will help determine the effectiveness of erosion and sediment control measures and the potential need to implement additional measures.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2894	618 - 38	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	v. BURNCO needs to provide clarification if increased evapotranspiration from the lake was incorporated into water modeling.	<p>The hydrogeological modelling and analysis conducted for the Project is presented in Part G, Section 22, Appendix 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Confirming that increased evaporation resulting from the change in pit lake surface area was incorporated into the model. specified flux boundary that represents recharge to groundwater from precipitation was automatically adjusted during model simulation in the area of the pit lake for increased evaporation at each phase of mine development.</p>
2895	618 - 39	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vi. BURNCO needs to provide clarification if recharge applied in the groundwater model looked at difference rates for construction, operation and closure due to different ground cover and whether the groundwater modelling did sensitivity studies to look at different hydraulic properties of the bedrock.	<p>The hydrogeological modelling and analysis conducted for the Project, including sensitivity analyses, are presented in Part G, Section 22, Appendix 5.6-D of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The groundwater model simulated groundwater conditions resulting from aggregate removal throughout the Project life, including at closure. The model boundaries were adjusted over time to account for changes in ground cover and lake surface area. The assessment of uncertainty in model predictions was carried out by conducting a model sensitivity analysis, including simulations of the flux representing groundwater discharge from bedrock to the valley fill aquifer (base case +/- 2).</p>
2896	618 - 40	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	vii. The environmental assessment certificate needs to include monitoring requirements following closure/reclamation of the site to ensure that the model's conclusions were accurate.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2897	618 - 41	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	viii. The influence of the pit lake level on flow and level of McNab Creek should be monitored seasonally and during peak and reduced precipitation periods, and over a long enough period, to find the best level to maintain tin the pit and McNab Creek.	A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include: - Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations. - During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope. - The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.
2898	618 - 42	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	ix. The effect of any upwelling of groundwater originating from the pit and entering McNab Creek or directly into Howe Sound via the foreshore should be assessed to determine if it is likely to disturb spawning area or contribute to undesirable siting effects.	Please refer to Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat. There is predicted to be increased groundwater influx into the groundwater-fed channels below the proposed pit lake. The increased levels of influx and more stable baseflows is expected to improve conditions for spawning by improving intergravel flow supporting egg and alevin survival. The total amount of freshwater input into the estuary will not be changed but it will be more uniformly distributed amongst the groundwater-fed channels. The Aquatic Health Assessment found that the Water quality of the pit lake Outflow (both surface and groundwater) would be suitable for all life history stages of salmonids.
2899	618 - 43	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	x. A plan for post-project use of the pit lake should be in place to consider issues such as potential stocking of fish.	A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.  Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2900	618 - 44	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Board Submission	Sunshine Coast, BC	i. The lakeshore slope should be designed to ensure that people and animals that use the lake can easily get on shore.	A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit. The perimeter of the pit lake will be designed to allow for an escape route for large mammals (See Mitigation Measure M-5.3-55 described in Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS).



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2901	619 - 1	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Natural Resource Advisory Committee	Sunshine Coast, BC	<p>Further to BURNCO Rock Products Ltd.'s application for an environmental assessment certificate for an aggregate project in the McNab Valley, West Howe Sound, The SCRD's Natural Resource Advisory Committee considered the proposal at its meeting of September 21, 2016.</p> <p>Previous NRAC reviews and recommendations were incorporated into the SCRD Board's input, however it was not possible for the SCRD Board to consider the NRAC's most recent recommendations due to the tight timeline between the two meetings. Thus the following are not a formal SCRD Board submission:</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2902	619 - 2	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Natural Resource Advisory Committee	Sunshine Coast, BC	1. That the Proponent monitors turbidity and total suspended solids when lake water is discharged into the stream channel.	<p>Suspended sediment sampling will be conducted in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan for the Project. A site-specific erosion and sediment control plan has been developed for each Project phase (please see Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 3).</p> <p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act.</p>
2903	619 - 3	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Natural Resource Advisory Committee	Sunshine Coast, BC	2. That sediment, erosion and water management practices are reassessed as the water balance model is updated, and that any changes to water, sediment and erosion management practices are communicated to the SCRD.	Suspended sediment sampling will be conducted in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan for the Project. A site-specific erosion and sediment control plan has been developed for each Project phase (please see Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 3). Weekly inspections by a qualified environmental monitor will be conducted during periods when ground disturbance activities are being undertaken. Inspections will include a description of pre-site activity conditions, implementation of erosion and sediment control measures, monitoring of control measures, and records of visual observations. Additional event-based inspections, in response to expected storm events or heavy rain events, will also be undertaken to inspect erosion control measurements according to the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan (see Section 7.0). Monitoring will be conducted immediately upstream and downstream of disturbed areas in order to compare potential sediment inputs against background levels. These inspections will help determine the effectiveness of erosion and sediment control measures and the potential need to implement additional measures.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2904	619 - 4	Sunshine Coast Regional District, Natural Resource Advisory Committee	Sunshine Coast, BC	3. That the SCRD request a detailed conceptual plan for closure conditions and consider how to best support appropriate future land use in the area.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2905	620 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Ontario	WAKE UP. Please don't destroy Howe Sound again.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2906	621 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I do not agree with this project because of its impact on critical salmon habitat, eco tourism, and the future of Howe sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2907	621 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I do not agree with this project because of its impact on critical salmon habitat, eco tourism, and the future of Howe sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2908	621 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I do not agree with this project because of its impact on critical salmon habitat, eco tourism, and the future of Howe sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2909	622 - 1	Tim Turner	Gibsons, BC	When will the politicians who represent us have the courage, the vision and the boldness to act in our collective best interest and say no to the Burnco proposal? Now I hope.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2910	622 - 2	Tim Turner	Gibsons, BC	There is nothing as valuable to the people of the Sea to Sky region than a large healthy estuary, the integrity of its sound scape and the powerful symbol of a wild place that we protected because we knew that the McNab Creek estuary is worth way more than the gravel beneath it.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2911	622 - 3	Tim Turner	Gibsons, BC	There is nothing as valuable to the people of the Sea to Sky region than a large healthy estuary, the integrity of its sound scape and the powerful symbol of a wild place that we protected because we knew that the McNab Creek estuary is worth way more than the gravel beneath it.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
2912	623 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I oppose the Burnco application for following reasons:</p> <p>* LOCATION UNSUITABLE. Far too close to existing residential properties. The unsightliness, noise and pollution from gravel mine and crush mill would be intolerable. SCRD in 2009 refused permit for McNab Creek aggregate mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2913	623 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	<p>I oppose the Burnco application for following reasons:</p> <p>* LOCATION UNSUITABLE. Far too close to existing residential properties. The unsightliness, noise and pollution from gravel mine and crush mill would be intolerable. SCRD in 2009 refused permit for McNab Creek aggregate mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2914	623 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	* LOSS OF HABITAT. The likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab creek due to aggregate mining has caused Fisheries and Oceans Canada twice to reject the project application. That should be the end of it.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2915	623 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	* LOSS OF HABITAT. The likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab creek due to aggregate mining has caused Fisheries and Oceans Canada twice to reject the project application. That should be the end of it.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2916	623 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	* SPECIES AT RISK. If, as has been documented by Burnco consultants, McNab creek is home to more than a dozen species at risk, including Roosevelt Elk which were reintroduced there in 2001 by the BC Ministry of Environment, it follows that project approval should be rejected under the terms of the Precautionary Principle.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2917	623 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	* BARGE TRAFFIC HAZARD. Howe Sound is a thriving tourist destination. The addition of up to half a dozen tug/gravel barge transits daily through the sound further would complicate already busy commercial and recreational vessel traffic patterns in that narrow waterway, thereby increasing significantly the risk of serious accident.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
2918	623 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Howe Sound, BC	*PRIOR CONSULTATION. McNab Creek lies in Sechelt traditional territory. The Sechelt First Nation has not been consulted by Burnco regarding the proposed gravel quarry. Community approval not granted.	First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.
2919	624 - 1	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	As a life long North Shore resident and avid swimmer of Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco Mine Project proposal. There are too many potential environmental risks associated with the project. Just recently we have seen an improvement in water quality in Howe Sound after many years of cleanup from the Britannia mine. There is enough industry impacting the waters of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2920	624 - 2	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	The salmon and other species that call the Howe Sound home need to be preserved and protected.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2921	624 - 3	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	The environment needs to be a priority over profit.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2922	625 - 1	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	Please find attached the Gambier Island Local Trust Committee's submission to the EAO as part of the Public Comment Period for the BURNCO application.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2923	625 - 2	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p>The Gambier Island Local Trust Committee is a local government with the land use planning responsibility for the land and marine areas for Howe Sound (apart from the Municipality of Bowen Island). As well, our Local Trust Committee, and the Islands Trust as a whole, has a unique legislative mandate to preserve and protect the fragile ecology and communities of the islands in the Salish Sea. To that end, we have a number of submissions to make related to the BURNCO proposal to develop a gravel extraction, processing and shipping facility at McNab Creek.</p> <p>The Executive Committee of the Islands Trust has the responsibility of speaking to issues of marine safety and environmental health within the Trust Area. The Chair of the Executive Committee is sending a letter addressing Trust wide policy's regarding this project. We have not addressed in this submission the concerns of many related to impacts on marine and terrestrial habitats surrounding the project and that is not because we do not share those concerns but because we wish to focus on certain issues as set out below.</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2924	625 - 3	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p>Our Official Community Plans, extending 300 metres beyond Gambier Island and 150 metres beyond all Associated Islands, commit to the following Community Goals which are relevant to this proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To fulfill the object of the Islands Trust, which is to preserve and protect the trust area and its unique amenities and environment for the benefit of the residents of the trust area and of British Columbia generally, in cooperation with municipalities, regional districts, improvement districts, other persons and organizations and the government of British Columbia.</li> <li>- To preserve, protect and enhance the rural character, peacefulness, natural beauty and views of the Gambier Island Planning Area.</li> <li>- To provide for a variety of quality natural recreational experiences for residents and visitors in a manner that leaves the land in a relatively undisturbed or wilderness condition consistent with maintaining the local trust area's rural tranquility and ecological balance.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2925	625 - 4	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	As the Islands Trust Executive Committee will be reviewing wider marine issues of this proposed project, the Gambier Island Local Trust Committee has determined to limit its submissions to affected neighbour issues that impact the goals of the Gambier Island Official Community Plan: a) Air pollution issues b) Noise issues and operating hours c) Visual impacts and operating hours d) General Community Concerns and acceptability of industrial activity in Howe Sound.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2926	625 - 5	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	Air Pollution concerns We note that here, along with elsewhere in the application, the applicant addresses cumulative impacts from the perspective of current conditions and levels of activity. This reflects the flaw in our current assessment system in that it doesn't take into account the cumulative impact of this project, the Woodfibre LNG project, increased traffic on the Sea to Sky Highway, and industrial activity elsewhere on the Sunshine Coast. Each project is viewed in isolation against a backdrop of what is happening at this point in time rather than what is likely to happen in the near term. The Howe Sound air-shed, similar to the marine environment, is currently in a recovery state due to the cessation of some industrial activity and controls on other activities but that improvement is fragile. We urge the EAO to review the cumulative impact of this project on the air-shed (and on other values) including all the planned and projected activity that would affect this air-shed, rather than just based on the current background pollution concerns.	Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2927	625 - 6	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	Regarding the dust and solid particulate emitting from the processing and transport of the gravel, we recognize that the applicant has put in place procedures to control the emissions in the processing area both through the use of "below ground" or enclosed procedures and through the use of "watering" processes. We urge that those processes be a condition of any approval.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p>
2928	625 - 7	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	We remain concerned with the impacts from conveying the processed gravel to barges and then the barging process itself. Controls on emissions of particulate from these processes appears inadequate; when loading barges, the gravel will have to "fall" some distance which will inevitably lead to dust and other emissions. The facility in Sechelt emits a lot of gravel dust which is a nuisance to the community surrounding the facility. Methods to control this (enclosed tubes for example) are an important measure that should be required for the project.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. Mitigation measures for fugitive barge emissions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barges will only be travelling loaded in one direction;</li> <li>- The barges will have 2.74 m boxwalls which will act as partial windscreens;</li> <li>- The loaded aggregate material will be wet; and</li> <li>- Five of the seven aggregate types will have material silt content less than 1.5%.</li> </ul> <p>NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2929	625 - 8	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	The applicant has indicated that an Air Quality and Dust Control Plan and an Air Quality and Meteorological Monitoring Program will be established prior to the construction phase. The LTC urges the EAO to require that both plans be submitted for review prior to approval of the project, and that they also include information on what steps the barging companies will take to prevent emissions while the gravel is in transit.	BURNCO will develop a project-specific website that will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed regarding the Project, including project schedule, construction activities, operating information, and noise and air quality monitoring data.  BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
2930	625 - 9	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	We also urge the EAO to require the applicant to include the full extent of the Regional Study Area in both the Air Quality and Dust Control Plan and the Air Quality Monitoring Program.	Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Regional Study Area is 80 km by 80 km (corresponding with the dispersion model domain) and is not likely a suitable extent for a project-specific plan and monitoring program.  BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
2931	625 - 10	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	Noise Issues While there are many concerns related to the environmental impacts, in terms of quality of life for neighbour, noise is probably the biggest concern. What is proposed is a gravel crushing and loading facility that will emit industrial noise. A number of matters seem problematic with the study: i) The EAO is unable to know from the information provided if account was made of the fact that sound travels over water in a far different manner than it does over land especially in the absence of wind which is a frequent occurrence in the summer months in this part of Howe Sound. In addition, it is not clear if calculations took into account the fact that the project will be take place in a valley surrounded by mountains reflecting sound.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.
2932	625 - 11	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	ii) The study prepared concludes that the impact will be “negligible”, which is defined as <3Db change from the Ambient Sound Levels. The ASLs for the receptor NR4 at Camp Latona are lower than at other receptors and a change in sound would likely be more noticeable. Likely, most levels of Low Frequency Noise and High Annoyance Noise will have an impact on the remote experience for landowners and visitors to this area.	The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects. Therefore the LSA will not be expanded.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2933	625 - 12	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p>iii) Decibel levels do not reflect that fundamental change in the experience of the environment. The baseline study recognizes that, with very limited exceptions, current ambient noise is from birds, water flowing, wind, and waves. Natural sounds that are one of the reasons people come to this area to experience nature. If that background sound is replaced instead with industrial noise, it will completely change the nature experience.</p> <p>In this instance, we believe that the EAO require a separate independent study related to noise effects, where the actual noise of the facility is simulated and the effects measured in a variety of weather conditions in a variety of locations.</p>	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.
2934	625 - 13	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	We are also concerned with the noise that will emanate from the barge loading as this will occur beyond any barriers. The chances of this producing unsatisfactory noise, in our view, is great and there appear to be no "noise deadening" measures proposed beyond raising or lowering the conveyor belt. We propose that some method of deadening the noise of gravel entering a barge should be a condition of any approval.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p>
2935	625 - 14	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	We are concerned as well that the berms placed around the processing facility are not high enough or extensive enough to contain noise from that facility and submit that the berms should be higher than piles of material and planted with sound absorbing vegetation such as large trees.	<p>Project details, including the location of the processing plant, the configuration of the stockpiles and the Processing Plant Dirt Berm, have been designed in part to mitigate potential noise effects. Other noise mitigation include the use of mufflers/silencers and fabric enclosures, equipment maintenance and scheduling of activities to reduce disruption to nearby residents.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation, potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>A Noise Management Plan will describe how noise will be managed on site in accordance with the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC. Noise monitoring locations and measures that can be implemented to reduce noise effects will be included in the Noise Management Plan. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2936	625 - 15	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	The facility should only emit noise while it is operating and thus the hours of operation are an important consideration. At present, the applicant indicates that it will operate during "daylight hours" which it defines as 7am to 10pm. We submit that to have the least impact on the surrounding communities, both operation and barging hours should be strictly limited to a 9am to 5pm period all year round and that no operations be permitted on weekends or statutory holidays. The communities surrounding the proposed facility are most heavily used during summer months and on weekends. The EAO should also require the proponent to undertake the four-month construction phase between October and April when there are fewer recreational visitors in Howe Sound.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2937	625 - 16	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	The facility should only emit noise while it is operating and thus the hours of operation are an important consideration. At present, the applicant indicates that it will operate during "daylight hours" which it defines as 7am to 10pm. We submit that to have the least impact on the surrounding communities, both operation and barging hours should be strictly limited to a 9am to 5pm period all year round and that no operations be permitted on weekends or statutory holidays. The communities surrounding the proposed facility are most heavily used during summer months and on weekends. The EAO should also require the proponent to undertake the four-month construction phase between October and April when there are fewer recreational visitors in Howe Sound.	The estimated duration of project construction will be up to two years. Some components will be constructed relatively quickly, while others will take longer depending on manufacturing times, construction windows and other limitations associated with the location of the Project site.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2938	625 - 17	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p><b>Visual Impacts</b></p> <p>The study indicates that Viewpoint 5 from Camp Latona would be impacted by changes to the landscape, scenic character, and light at night. While the study assesses the impact as Low, account must be made for the impact such a change would have on the current use. Enjoyment of the natural viewscape is a key current use of Camp Latona, the Burrard Yacht Club outstation at Ekins Point, and the secured strip of shoreline park Crown land along the northern side of Gambier Island. We urge any approval to require sufficient tree cover to ensure that the operations are not visible from any of these locations.</p> <p>We believe much of the light pollution issues would be addressed by limiting operations to occur during the hours of 9am to 5pm. We submit that this should also be the case for loading and barging as light pollution will emanate from that activity as well. We have been advised that when no operations or loading is occurring, there will only be minimal lighting on the water for navigation purposes and minimal lighting in the plant area. This should be a condition of any permit.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
2939	625 - 18	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p><b>Community Concerns</b></p> <p>The Gambier Island Local Trust Area includes a number of communities that are affected by this proposal. We submit that many of the concerns being expressed by those community members and by others stem from their experience of this area as a wilderness jewel that is not suitable for industrial development despite its history. There is no doubt that Howe Sound has a history of industrial use, but the resurgence of industrial use in Howe Sound is not consistent with the mandate of the Islands Trust.</p> <p>While we appreciate that the applicant has taken some steps to ameliorate concerns relative to the environment, in the end the proposal is not consistent with the Local Trust Area's official community plans nor the Trust mandate to "preserve and protect the environment and unique amenities" of our Local Trust Area for the benefit of all British Columbia.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2940	625 - 19	Gambier Island Local Trust Committee	Gambier Island, BC	<p>As a result, we urge:</p> <p>a) The EAO to recommend rejection of the proposal.</p> <p>b) Alternatively, to include in its condition or recommendations the specific points set out above.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2941	626 - 1	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	Please accept this submission for the EAO process for Burnco's aggregate mine project proposal on McNab Creek. I am submitting this based on my knowledge of Howe Sound in my work with the David Suzuki Foundation and as a Bowen Island resident who cares deeply about the sustainability of projects in this region.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2942	626 - 2	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	I have convened numerous community forums and meetings in the Howe Sound region over the past three years. People consistently speak to the desire to help nurture a fragile marine recovery we're experiencing after years of pollution to the region. No one wants to see us return to an era when marine dead zones defined our ocean. I've heard many express a desire to live within the bounds of nature and to be guided by an understanding that economic opportunities must be based on an understanding of ecosystem health.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2943	626 - 3	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that environmental risks associated with this project may include mitigating for the impact of climate change on water quality and flows and potential effects on wildlife, in particular, salmon.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.  Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to provincial, federal and global totals were determined to be negligible.
2944	626 - 4	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that environmental risks associated with this project may include mitigating for the impact of climate change on water quality and flows and potential effects on wildlife, in particular, salmon.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 (Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2945	626 - 5	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that environmental risks associated with this project may include mitigating for the impact of climate change on water quality and flows and potential effects on wildlife, in particular, salmon.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2946	626 - 6	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	I understand that environmental risks associated with this project may include mitigating for the impact of climate change on water quality and flows and potential effects on wildlife, in particular, salmon.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2947	626 - 7	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	Unfortunately, the short time given to read and comment on technical information and project-related communications between the government and industry limits me from more substantive comments.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2948	626 - 8	David Suzuki Foundation	Bowen Island, BC	<p>I would like to focus on one area that I believe this project must uphold if we are to hold companies responsible for the pollution they create and the remediation they promise. That area is financial sureties. I believe that it must be a requirement for this project to proceed to require substantial financial sureties up front before project approval is given.</p> <p>These sureties must include covenants and caveats that benefit both the environment and taxpayers. This requirement is supported by the 2012 federal Auditor General's report on environmental financial liability: <a href="http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201212_02_e_37711.html">http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201212_02_e_37711.html</a></p> <p>Chapter 2 of the report states: "The environmental costs resulting from natural resource development projects can run into tens of millions—or in rare cases billions of dollars". The report estimates the cost to clean up federal contaminated sites exceeded \$7 billion, with costs increasing every year.</p> <p>Environmental financial assurances are an important safeguard for the environment. They provide funds for future environmental liabilities to be paid by a proponent or operator. They also provide for liabilities arising from projects with long lifespans where costs associated with decommissioning may not become known for decades. In conjunction with a regulatory framework, they can act as a powerful incentive to industry to reduce environmental impacts as a core part of business.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
2949	627 - 1	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Please find my comments concerning the Burnco proposal for McNab creek Howe Sound in the attached document.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2950	627 - 2	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comments to Environmental Assessment Office regarding Burnco Aggregate Project McNab Creek, Howe Sound, BC Submitted October 3, 2016 Ir. Johan Huibert Anton van Walraven 351 Eagles Nest Rd, Bowen Island, BC V0N1G1</p> <p>Background Ingenieur degree Industrial Design (7 year Master degree equivalent), Technical University of Delft, the Netherlands (1984-1991) 1992 – 1999 Graphic design, industrial design and architectural IT consultant. 2001 – 2009 Staff forest campaign, volunteer coordination and IT (Western Canada) Wilderness Committee, Vancouver BC Resident, Bowen Island, 2003 - present Member of lead team Concerned Citizens Bowen – ccbowen.ca, 2015 - present Member of volunteer research team regarding Herring spawn in Upper Howe Sound and possible effects of Woodfibre LNG's Once Through Cooling System proposal on Herring Spawn, August 2015 - present.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
2951	627 - 3	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 1: The environmental Assessment process has been recognized to be 'broken' and its results to be lacking the public trust. One of the reasons EA process is considered 'broken' is due to the fact that the regulator's job is to judge the merits of the project proponents conclusions, and to be relying in their judgment on the work of the public during the public comment process, and the members of the Working Group. Both public comment process and Working Group participants lack time and resources to adequately do their work. (Acknowledged by Golder Associate representatives at the Burnco Information session on September 14 2016 in West Vancouver).</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2952	627 - 4	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>- As of to date Burnco Rock Products Ltd. and its principal officers has, since July 27 2006, donated \$ 286,700 to the BC Liberal party, the party that has formed the BC Government since 2001. (Source Elections BC)</p> <p>- On November 24 2013, more than a year before the Environmental Assessment of the Woodfibre LNG project started, the Province of B.C. posted a video on youtube.com concerning a trade trip for Premier Clark to China. We hear the Premier speaking and this is part of the transcript: "I just came back from Rudong, Jiangsu Province near Shanghai. I saw the most incredible feat of engineering you will find in just about anywhere. The longest LNG pipeline in the world overland. It goes out about 20 kilometers, out from the shore. So they can receive LNG from around the world, AND THAT IS WHERE we are going to connect Squamish British Columbia to...China. As Woodfibre [LNG] build their facility in B.C. to export natural gas...over here [China]." <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwB2tN9xly8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwB2tN9xly8</a></p> <p>- As of to date, Woodfibre LNG and its principal officers have donated \$91, 689 to the BC Liberal party. (Source Elections BC)</p> <p>- How could the Premier make this statement with the clear emphasis and conviction that Squamish would connect to China through the natural gas exports of Woodfibre LNG?</p> <p>- The Environmental Assessment of the Woodfibre LNG project was flawed and clearly rigged, as the video proves, even before the assessment of the project started.</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2953	627 - 5	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 1.1: How can the public be certain that the recommendations coming out of the Environmental Assessment process properly reflect the real impact this proposal would have on the McNab creek estuary?</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
2954	627 - 6	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 1.2: How can we trust that a Minister, whose party has received \$ 286,700 in donations from a company, will make a fair and unbiased decision, when the track record of this BC government shows an all together different pattern?</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2955	627 - 7	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 2: Estuaries deliver invaluable ecosystem services. The entire Howe Sound inlet has very limited wild and functional estuary. McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound that is still functional, while the other estuaries in Howe Sound were destroyed and replaced by urban or industrial development (Britania beach, Horseshoe Bay, Snug Cove Bowen Island, Mill creek at Woodfibre, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estuaries provide ecosystem services that are fundamental life-support processes upon which all organisms depend (Daily et al., 1997). Two ecosystem services that estuaries provide are water filtration and habitat protection.</li> <li>- McNab Creek is the second largest estuary of the few remaining natural estuaries in Howe Sound.</li> <li>- Estuaries form a tiny portion of Howe Sound's total shoreline but are its richest shoreline habitats in terms of biodiversity and biological productivity.</li> <li>- In the Howe Sound and broader context estuaries deserve the highest protection.</li> <li>- 'The options for adequate fish habitat compensation within McNab Creek or even the greater Howe Sound area are severely limited and may not allow the proposed development to meet DFO's fish habitat policy objectives, including the "No Net Loss" guiding principle' (DFO letter to Burnco R.P. Ltd – June 27 2011).</li> </ul> <p>Question 2.1: What is the justification for destroying 75% of the McNab estuary indefinitely when estuaries are regarded as seriously crucial to marine life and very few estuaries are found in Howe</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2956	627 - 8	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 3. ...Distinction must be made between 'the need of the market for gravel' in general and the economical opportunity that wet-mining of gravel from McNab Creek would provide to Burnco. Howe Sound has been 'explored' before and some deposits are already depleted. In absence of careful planning for supply aggregates for the Lower Mainland , question marks should be placed with appropriateness of pursuing this project in a functioning estuary.</p> <p>The 'Need for the project' is described in the earlier project description dated December 26, 2011. Although the project description is not part of the submission, it is found on the EAO ePic webpage for the Burnco submission. The document is crucial since it provides Burnco's rationale for pursuing the project in McNab creek.</p> <p>- In the chapter 'Need for the project' it is stated: 'With the steady growth of the population of BC's South Coast, along with continued depletion of existing local aggregate supplies, there is a need to locate and develop new sources of aggregate in proximity to the Lower Mainland. The relative cost of aggregate is often low, but transportation costs are high, often eclipsing the cost of the product. Shipping by water is the most cost-effective way of transporting aggregate products, and shipping short distances by water further reduces environmental and societal costs.'</p> <p>- The need for aggregates is clear, but it is unclear how planning initiatives, like the 'Aggregate and Demand – Update and Analyses', Nov 2013, prepared for the Regional District of Central</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Wet mining is the selected mining method because of the proximity of the aggregate deposit relative to the existing water table. Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2957	627 - 9	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 4. (Adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Burnco proposal largely blocks the animal corridor between upper McNab valley and shoreline, functionally disconnecting estuary from uplands. The proposal intends to fill three quarters of the lower one kilometer of the McNab Creek valley with a 24/7 industrial operation that will alienate that area from wildlife, and spread industrial noise throughout the lower valley for at least the project lifetime. It is inconceivable that this industrial noise and land alienation will not greatly limit the function of the lower valley as habitat and greatly disconnect migration of mammals such as elk, black bear, wolves, and grizzly bear between upper valley and the shore. Local observations show the estuary is heavily used by elk and black bear, and occasionally by grizzly bear and wolves. I have visited McNab Creek many times and have seen the tracks.</p> <p>Question 4.1: How will the project proposal offset the project impacts on elk, bear and wolf migration along the valley floor from upper valley to estuary?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2958	627 - 10	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 4.2: Given ongoing forestry operations in McNab Creek valley, and extensive past cutting of valley floor forests, and recent construction of the Box Canyon power project, how does the additional impact of the Burnco proposal relate to the cumulative impacts of other past and ongoing industry in the valley?</p> <p>Question 4.3: What cumulative effects assessment has been made of ecosystem health of the McNab Creek valley?</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2959	627 - 11	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 5: Proposed 'reclamation' plan narrow in scope and fails to identify what an estuary is. The 'reclamation' plan is designed in terms of growing forests, fails to recognize the need for providing area for the main creek to wander across its natural floodplain over time. The use of the word of reclamation, which refers to land, should be considered inappropriate and misleading, when 75% of the effected area is turned into a lake.</p> <p>- Within Canada it is understood that reclamation means "The process of reconvertng disturbed land to its former or other productive uses." (Powter, Chris, 2002).</p> <p>- The inventory of the soil across the area where the lake would be dug, is narrow in scope. It classifies the soil in terms of being good or poor, which should not be surprising since we are dealing with an estuary. The soil quality distribution across the flat floodplain signifies an estuary, in which the creek has wandered, had different creek beds and deposited sediments in changing areas over time. To project the model of a forest onto an area that is an estuary is odd and would do nothing in terms of reclamation, unless one prefers forests over estuaries.</p> <p>- In contrast with reality, subsequent B.C. governments and their ministries of Forests have declared over time that clearcut logging of old-growth forest, would be adequately replaced by tree planting and to follow second growth forests would be an equivalent replacement. The clearcut logging of Old growth, and subsequent logging of second growth in rotation cycles leads to the known "Falldown" effect on forests. (soil degradation, loss of biodiversity, lack of ability to grow forest – report: Kellogg, R.M.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See responses to specific questions below.</p>
2960	627 - 12	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 5.1 Is the downgrade of forest capability from Class 1 forest to Class 3 forest in some parts of the McNab estuary an acknowledgement that forest practices in B.C. are indeed highly destructive practices, a misunderstanding of the soil composition you would expect to find in an estuary, or is the reclassification from Class 1 forest to Class 3 a self-serving exercise?</p> <p>Question 5.2: Why is the reclamation plan not based on reestablishing a Class 1 forest after closure?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2961	627 - 13	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 5.3: Why is there no mention of the mature forest areas that will be cleared for the Processing/Stockpiles Area at the shoreface?</p>	<p>We recognize that soils mapping was conducted at a reconnaissance level and based on existing geotechnical borehole and test pit data and existing publically available soils maps. We believe that this information was sufficient for EAC Application/EIS that required LSA soils mapping at a 1:5000-scale.</p> <p>Subsequent soil surveys including additional soil plot locations in the Processing Area, plus select soil sample collection and analytical testing for soil quality will be completed prior to surface preparation. This information combined with the preliminary EAC Application/EIS soils mapping and geotechnical subsurface data will be used to prepare updated soil maps and soil salvage and reclamation plans as required for the BURNCO Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA).</p> <p>Mature forest areas that will be cleared are noted in Volume 2, Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS: The Proposed Project will remove approximately 3.3% (4 ha) of mature coniferous forest for the marine conveyor belt system in the LSA.</p>
2962	627 - 14	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 6: (partly adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) The project will permanently isolate McNab Creek from migration across the majority of its natural floodplain. The suggestion that the pitlake would not effect flow levels in McNab creek is based on the premis of adequate precipitation to sustain an 'overpressure' on the area east of the lake and prevent 'leaking' from the Creek into the lake.</p> <p>The natural habit of the river is to wander back and forth across its natural floodplain and estuary. Berms surrounding the proposed pit will permanently restrict McNab Creek to the eastern margin of the estuary. The berms will isolate the Creek from three quarters of its natural fan delta, removing the Creek's ability to directly replenish sediment to the western part of the estuary and create diverse habitats. Given ongoing sea level rise, forecast to be at least 1 m rise by 2100, this lack of direct sedimentation to the western estuary will increase the risk of shoreline erosion, wet meadow and tidal flat erosion, and shoreline retreat, with consequent valuable habitat loss throughout this area.</p> <p>- The 'Historic Climate Analyses for Howe Sound' (Burnco EA App. Appendix 5.8-A) is limited to the West side of Howe Sound and limited to the period 1971 to 2010. Since 2010 we are experiencing the effects of climate change with dryer conditions in South Western B.C., characterized by longer spells of dry weather and alternated by sudden burst of precipitation. During these burst, the rain water tends to flow off rather than being absorbed by the soil and to cause soil erosion.</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2963	627 - 15	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 6.2: Will the sudden rising levels of the pitlake caused by precipitation burst demand the release of large amounts of water into the rearing channel projected to replace Water Course 2?	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
2964	627 - 16	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 6.3: Would the need for releases due to precipitation burst overwhelm the proposed new rearing channel that is calculated to withstand a few artificial freshet events(lake releases) per year?	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p> <p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2965	627 - 17	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 7: Replacement of Water Course 2 by new to build artificial rearing channel</p> <p>Water Course 2 (WC2) was built to compensate for the dredging Rainy River's natural spawning and rearing fish habitat. The dredging was done to allow marine traffic for the Howe Sound Pulp and Paper. The reasons for the building of WC2 are not mentioned in the Burnco's EA application. With the lack of options to compensate for fish habitat in Howe Sound, the location of McNab creek was chosen. The artificial channel that was built following design specifications of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WC2 lacks appropriate shading from trees, this will effect water temperature levels.</li> <li>- It is dubious that the artificial WC2 would qualify as adequate compensation of lost or damaged natural fish habitat at Rainy River.</li> <li>- The replacement of WC2 takes away any area for possible compensation for the negative effects caused by the mining operation on McNab creek itself.</li> <li>- The premises of sufficient precipitation is based on dated records (see comment 6).</li> <li>- It is no far stretch to conclude that the mining operation and the dykes needed to 'protect' lake from a course change of the creek will effect flow quantities in McNab Creek due to the changing precipitation patterns caused by climate change.</li> </ul> <p>Question 7.1: How would Burnco compensate for Serious Harm to fish in McNab creek caused by the caging McNab Creek to its</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2966	627 - 18	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 8: ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Inappropriate location for a Processing/Stockpiles Area At McNab, a forest 30-300m wide of second growth sitka spruce-hemlock forest 80-250 years old fringes the entire estuary shoreline. This mature forest is an essential element of the estuary, forming a natural transition between upland and wet meadow-tidal flats of the intertidal estuary. The entire one kilometer of estuary shoreline with fringing forest, intertidal marsh and mud-sand-cobble tidal flats intact at McNab Creek. This coastal strip is the most valuable and sensitive part of the estuary.</p> <p>The Processing/Stockpiles Area is proposed within the fringing forest of this coastal strip. This will require clearing of a large tract of mature second growth 80-250 year old hemlock-sitka spruce forest. This forest zone is 150-200m wide at the Processing/Stockpiles Area site and all but a sliver-thin buffer will be lost.</p> <p>Question 8.1: Why is the processing facility not located inland, north of the power line, and well back from the most ecologically sensitive area of the estuary?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> </ul> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2967	627 - 19	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 9 : ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Environmental bonding Given the high ecological values of McNab Creek estuary, and the large impacts this proposal will impose on the estuary, and the critical role that estuaries play in Howe Sound, this proposal also poses serious risks to the larger ecosystem health of Howe Sound. Should a mine go ahead, it is critical that environmental reclamation and monitoring of reclamation works be successful to the highest standards. To ensure reclamation compliance, and public confidence that this will indeed be achieved, significant environmental bonds need to be in place.</p> <p>Question 9.1: What criteria are being used to evaluate the necessary level of environmental bonding for reclamation? Question 9.2: What amount of reclamation bonding is required of the proponent before start of works?</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2968	627 - 20	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 10: ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597] and added) This project will expand industrial activity to a new greenfield site in Howe Sound. This project is not compatible with the ongoing recovery of Howe Sound from past industrial activity, nor its recreational use. Is this the highest and best use for Howe Sound?</p> <p>It is widely recognized that Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity and several aggregate deposits in Howe Sound are already depleted. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. A recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Province has invested heavily in this enterprise, not the least of which are the ongoing costs of managing Britannia Mine effluent.</li> <li>- Britania Beach Contamination Cleanup near Squamish to cost \$99Million (Vancouver Sun June 10 2006) (Article removed from Vancouver Sun website , but posted here: <a href="http://www.6717000.com/blog/2006/06/britania-beach-contamination-cleanup-nearsquamish-to-cost-99m/">http://www.6717000.com/blog/2006/06/britania-beach-contamination-cleanup-nearsquamish-to-cost-99m/</a> )</li> <li>- As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. A new industrial operation on a new greenfield site with significant ecological impacts is out of step with these trends.</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
2969	627 - 21	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2970	627 - 22	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.1: What criteria suggest that this proposal is compatible with the "highest and best use" of the McNab Creek estuary and northern Thorborough Channel?	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
2971	627 - 23	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.2: What criteria suggest that the impacts of this proposal will not be detrimental to the ongoing recovery of marine ecosystems of Howe Sound?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2972	627 - 24	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.3: What criteria suggest there is a need for pitlake when we have Howe Sound?	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
2973	627 - 25	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Overall conclusion: - With the changing weather patterns due to climate changes. Patterns of dry spells alternated by precipitation burst, are being reported everywhere around the world.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS.
2974	627 - 26	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- The idea to dig a pit mine in an area that is the floodplain of an existing salmon and trout bearing creek and build a dyke to prevent the creek from changing course, will translate into a permanent situation were the creek and every fish living it will be exposed to a combination of low flow levels and very high flow levels.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.
2975	627 - 27	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- The ability of the creek to self-mediate through flooding and/or changing course will be lost. Therefore the possibility of Serious Harm to fish should be seriously considered.	An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.  The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B).



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2976	627 - 28	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- In the larger context, hundreds of Salmons stocks in B.C. have gone extinct due to bad logging practices. Stream and river keepers having been working hard to rebuild salmon habitat. In light of this it seems odd that a healthy Salmon and trout bearing stream would be unnecessarily exposed to the possibility of Serious Harm.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2977	627 - 29	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- Howe Sound has been exposed to enough industrial activity and has given up enough aggregate deposits. Time to let it heal.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2978	628 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Cumulative impact assessment should be done re dark night skies in Howe Sound.</p> <p>If Woodfibre LNG and BURNCO are built, that will make WF, BURNCO, and Howe Sound Pulp and Paper all with safety lights on at night at their industrial plants and dock facilities.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects, including visual quality. Changes in visual quality considered the potential for cumulative effects related to vegetation clearing and the installation and operation of land-based and marine-based infrastructure and night-time security lighting to the landscape visible from selected receptor sites. The Visual Quality CEA is presented in Section 7.4.5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS. All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2979	629 - 1	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity. It has taken several decades to begin to reverse some of the resulting damage. Toxic and cancer-causing chemicals were being used in the paper mills, creosote was being used as a piling preservative with damage to the ecosystem resulting. The water below the surface layer was the colour of Coca Cola and has been slowly recovering. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. Recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy. The Province has invested heavily in this recovery, not the least of which is the ongoing cost of managing Britannia Mine effluent.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
2980	629 - 2	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. We are Bowen residents and frequently kayak in the Sound.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
2981	629 - 3	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	A large new industrial operation in McNab Creek's fertile estuary, with major disruption to animal, fish and bird habitats, is totally out of line with these trends.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2982	629 - 4	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	A large new industrial operation in McNab Creek's fertile estuary, with major disruption to animal, fish and bird habitats, is totally out of line with these trends.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
2983	629 - 5	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	A large new industrial operation in McNab Creek's fertile estuary, with major disruption to animal, fish and bird habitats, is totally out of line with these trends.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2984	629 - 6	Claire Weeks and Peter Wing	Bowen Island, BC	<p>This is especially true as there are less damaging options (listed by Dr Bob Turner) which should be considered rather than diverting and damaging the McNab estuary.</p> <p><a href="http://www.nsnews.com/news/how-now-howe-sound-1.346230">http://www.nsnews.com/news/how-now-howe-sound-1.346230</a>  <a href="http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/return-of-industry-threatens-renewal-of-howe-sounds-marine-ecosystem/article14952818/">http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/return-of-industry-threatens-renewal-of-howe-sounds-marine-ecosystem/article14952818/</a></p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2985	630 - 1	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	I am opposed to Burnco's proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek in Howe Sound, regardless of the company's proposed mitigation plans.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2986	630 - 2	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	This is the wrong development, in the wrong place, for the wrong reasons, at the wrong time, using a seriously flawed process.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
2987	630 - 3	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	Wrong Development Burnco proposes to mine 20 million tons of gravel from the ancient McNab Estuary for the next 16 years. This project will have large negative environmental and health impacts for residents, visitors, and future generations – of people, as well as land, air, and marine wildlife.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects.
2988	630 - 4	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	Such environmental destruction in exchange for corporate benefit flowing to a privately held, Alberta-owned company, and a handful of jobs, is not sustainable development in the sense of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, to which Canada is a signatory.	BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.  BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.  BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2989	630 - 5	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	Such environmental destruction in exchange for corporate benefit flowing to a privately held, Alberta-owned company, and a handful of jobs, is not sustainable development in the sense of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, to which Canada is a signatory.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
2990	630 - 6	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	Such environmental destruction in exchange for corporate benefit flowing to a privately held, Alberta-owned company, and a handful of jobs, is not sustainable development in the sense of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, to which Canada is a signatory.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2991	630 - 7	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Wrong Place</p> <p>Having lived in Lions Bay for almost 20 years, I am very fortunate to be able to see, hear, and enjoy evidence of the amazing recovery happening in Howe Sound on a daily basis.</p> <p>Visitors from the Lower Mainland, the rest of Canada, and from all over the world routinely tell me how lucky I am to live in such a beautiful place, how much they have loved their visit, how much they look forward to returning, and how they will recommend others to visit this precious gem, so close to Vancouver, Squamish and Whistler/Blackcomb, all top-notch tourist destinations in their own right.</p> <p>They are astonished and perplexed to learn about the current onslaught of industrial re-development projects up and down the Sound.</p> <p>Why risk ruining something so precious, which is so important to local recreation and tourism alike?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2992	630 - 8	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>As noted by the David Suzuki Foundation in its 2015 report entitled "Sound Investment – Measuring the Return on Howe Sound's Ecosystem Assets":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Howe Sound ecosystem is of critical importance to keeping our environment in balance</li> <li>• The sound provides habitat and sheltered access to a range of species and is high in biological diversity</li> <li>• The aquatic environments support over 650 different species of fish and invertebrates, including rock cod, salmon, shellfish and herring</li> <li>• Marine mammals include seals, sea lions, dolphins, orcas and humpback whales</li> </ul> <p>"One can estimate the health of the aquatic ecosystems by considering the status of salmon and orcas, which are keystone or indicator species that are sensitive to changes in water quality, trophic webs and pollution levels. The closure of the salmon fishery and rarity of orca sightings over the past few decades appear to fit the classic ecosystem theory that size of organisms declines with degraded ecosystems. To the amazement of all, this trend is reversing. The salmon fishery has re-opened, orcas have returned and humpback whales have been sighted." David Suzuki Foundation (2015) "Sound Investment – Measuring the Return on Howe Sound's Ecosystem Assets", p. 20</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
2993	630 - 9	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Wrong Reasons</p> <p>Burnco says it needs the gravel to meet ever increasing demands for aggregate in the Lower Mainland. However, by Burnco's own admission, "the volume of aggregate we are applying to mine through this project is up to 20 million tonnes, which by itself wouldn't even fulfill the need required in the Lower Mainland for one year — 30 million tonnes" (Burnco's website).</p> <p>So why risk ruining precious environmental resources and values in spectacular Howe Sound if it is only going to be a drop in the bucket?</p> <p>Giving a private Alberta company a way to off-set corporate profits elsewhere seems a very poor reason to allow re-industrialization of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2994	630 - 10	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Nor should this be seen as a way to provide jobs. Once up and running, there will only be 12 jobs. Far more current jobs will be protected, and far more new ones will be created, WITHOUT this gravel mine.</p> <p>The ecosystem benefits of Howe Sound have been conservatively valued at between \$800 million and \$4.7 billion PER YEAR (2014 CAD). As further noted by the David Suzuki Foundation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecosystem services do not appear on the market, balance sheets or decision-making frameworks, yet they are essential for life, societal well-being and our economies</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2995	630 - 11	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Wrong Time</p> <p>As further noted by the David Suzuki Foundation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pollution from past industrial activity created a dead zone, where marine life was hard to find</li> <li>• costly investments were needed to replace the lost ecosystems and to rehabilitate the damaged environment</li> <li>• recovery efforts, which began in 1988, have been effective</li> <li>• life is returning to the sound, signalling ecosystem recovery</li> <li>• this recovery is of great interest to scientists around the world, as little is known of the dynamics of marine recovery</li> </ul> <p>Allowing Burnco to go ahead with this Gravel Mine in the vulnerable McNab Estuary, will – no matter the number and types of mitigation measures taken – reverse the trend toward recovery in Howe Sound and represent a huge waste of the dollars and hours spent to date to repair and restore the damaged environment from past industrial enterprises.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
2996	630 - 12	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>The Federal Government recently announced the appointment of an Expert Panel to review the Environmental Assessment process (which was gutted by the previous government). I wonder if Burnco is pushing for project now, before any possible strengthening of the Environmental Assessment process?</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2997	630 - 13	Birgitta von Krosigk	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Flawed Process</p> <p>Howe Sound is under threat from a number of big projects. The current environmental assessment process only looks at one project at a time, rather than considering the cumulative and knock-on effects of multiple projects. Once there is one facility creating noise, air and water pollution, it may seem “natural” to allow another.</p> <p>As noted by the David Suzuki Foundation”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial resurgence and nature recovery must be considered together — not in the current piecemeal approach that could set them on a collision course.</li> <li>The future of Howe Sound’s environment and economy is intricately connected.</li> <li>Careful choices must be made to ensure a healthy and sustainable future for natural systems and the economy.</li> </ul> <p>I attended one of the public information sessions hosted by Burnco.</p> <p>On my way out, I was offered a jar of “free” honey. No thank you. No amount of honey can make this a sweet deal.</p> <p>Do not grant Burnco permission to re-industrialize Howe Sound. Reject this proposal.</p> <p>(To access the David Suzuki Foundation report: <a href="http://www.davidsuzuki.org/publications/downloads/SoundInvestment-HoweSoundEcosystemAssets.pdf">http://www.davidsuzuki.org/publications/downloads/SoundInvestment-HoweSoundEcosystemAssets.pdf</a></p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
2998	631 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	<p>A beautiful estuary full of life and part of a sensitive ecosystem should not be destroyed. Especially for the benefit of a very few. Granting rights to damage an area full of vitality would be backward thinking.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
2999	632 - 1	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	I am opposed to granting this project an Environmental Certificate.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3000	632 - 2	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	Locating a dusty, noisy and environmentally destructive mine in the middle of iconic Howe Sound is simply unacceptable.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3001	632 - 3	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	Locating a dusty, noisy and environmentally destructive mine in the middle of iconic Howe Sound is simply unacceptable.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
3002	632 - 4	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	Locating a dusty, noisy and environmentally destructive mine in the middle of iconic Howe Sound is simply unacceptable.	<p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3003	632 - 5	Eoin Finn	Bowyer Island, BC	I have attached a report from the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) organization on the noisiness of typical aggregate mines. This does not belong in Howe Sound - refuse it.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p> <p>Site and activity specific Health and Safety Plans will outline specific procedures and protocols for working around active construction sites. BURNCO's corporate Health, Safety and Environment (HSE) Management Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G, Section 22, Appendix 16-B of th EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3004	633 - 1	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	This letter is being submitted as a result of your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products regarding its proposal for an open pit mine at McNabb Creek. While we have significant concerns that this is a highly flawed and biased process, we have no option but to “play the game” and “trust in the process”.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3005	633 - 2	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Burnco Rock Product's (Burnco's) proposed, large, open-pit aggregate mine and crushing facility is clearly contrary to regional commitments and development efforts in the area, and more importantly it is completely inconsistent with the established use of the area for primarily leisure purposes.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3006	633 - 3	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3007	633 - 4	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3008	633 - 5	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The proposed open pit mine should not be considered in isolation. The cumulative impact of other projects in the area need to form part of this assessment. In May 2015 the Auditor General of BC issued a report with nine recommendations and stated "it's in the interest of British Columbians to address cumulative effects management without delay" Howe Sound was selected as one of the Province's first regions for Cumulative Effects Assessment under the new framework.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3009	633 - 6	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>While the economic return will accrue to Burnco and a small number of local businesses, significant socio-economic costs and environmental damage to Howe Sound will be borne by the communities and residents of the area and the taxpayers of British Columbia who will derive little benefit from the project. The mine will generate only 12 full time jobs at around \$25/hr, similar to a less experienced construction worker. The aggregate itself may well replace aggregate from other parts of BC and thus the jobs may not be "net new" employment but rather "replacement employment", there is no benefit in this.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
3010	633 - 7	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Environmental Impacts</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3011	633 - 8	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3012	633 - 9	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3013	633 - 10	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3014	633 - 11	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>In fact, Oceans and Fisheries Canada (aka DFO) has already rejected such proposals in the past. With respect to the Burnco project, In June of 2010, DFO determined that the project would result in harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (“HADD”) of fish habitat that cannot be compensated elsewhere in the Sound. As such DFO advised Burnco that DFO was not prepared to issue a HADD authorization.</p> <p>In response, I understand Burnco filed a judicial review application against DFO in Supreme Court. Subsequently, DFO agreed to participate in a full environmental review. However, in June, 2011, DFO issued a letter in which they stated that they “continue to have serious concerns about the extent of the impacts to fish and fish habitat that may result from this project” and that “The project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat.”</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3015	633 - 12	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3016	633 - 13	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3017	633 - 14	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3018	633 - 15	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3019	633 - 16	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3020	633 - 17	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>A 2012 research project by Vancouver Aquarium found that the foreshore area directly in front of the proposed project is a marine rich habitat and an important and rare nursery area for various aquatic habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3021	633 - 18	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Burnco's Consultant's, Golder and Associates, clearly show in their assessments dust blooms extending far out to sea which over the 16 years of this projects lifetime will cause harmful silt and sediment build up across the foreshore area. The extent of these dust blooms directly contradict other Golder assurances that spraying mitigations will eliminate such dust blooms in the first place. Clearly Golder needs to do further work to get reconcile their opinions.</p> <p>The area can be very exposed to extreme wind conditions which are difficult to predict and monitor. The proponents air quality report shows particulate matter over the marine environment but the marine assessment contradicts this by saying there will be no sediment seems a little incongruous. We need to ensure that should the project go ahead this particulate matter is evaluated on a continuous basis both through air quality monitoring and monitoring of the marine ecosystems around the project. A build-up of silt in the marine environment cannot be allowed, over the course of the project it would destroy local marine life.</p>	<p>The air quality dispersion model predictions presented in Figures 5.7-2, 5.7-3, 5.7-4 and 5.7-5 represent in-air concentrations of particulate matter fractions and not predictions of dust deposition; the concentrations presented do not represent dust plumes. In addition, the dispersion modelling methods and associated assumptions - approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) - incorporated a high degree of conservatism. The air dispersion model was based on worst case daily emission rates and assumed worst case daily emissions every day of the year. These assumptions contributed to the high level of confidence in the air quality assessment predictions that there will no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The same Ministry-approved CALPUFF model that was used to predict air quality concentrations (i.e., run in dynamic [3D] mode with a fine resolution meteorological data set) was used to predict deposition rates which were incorporated into the surface water quality model and the assessment of potential effects on water quality and aquatic health. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3022	633 - 19	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder Associates also indicate the site could be home to up to 21 Species at Risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk that were transplanted to McNab Creek by the BC Ministry of Environment in 2001 in an effort to re-introduce the species to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3023	633 - 20	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	The current value of the McNabb area as salmon bearing habitat is downplayed in the proponent's report. Our own experience has been of a rejuvenation in fish stocks at McNab, reflecting the fish recovery seen elsewhere in Howe Sound. Greater scrutiny around this part of the report is necessary to reflect the true value of the creek as a salmon habitat.	<p>A description and quantification of potential spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 is provided in section 3.1.3.1 of Appendix 5.1-A and in Table 6 of the same appendix. A spawner survey conducted on 13 November 2016 re-affirmed the baseline description and observed less than 200 m2 of suitable salmonid spawning habitat based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth (&gt; 18cm).</p> <p>As described in section 3.1.3.2 of Appendix 5.1-A the lower section of WC2 consists of low gradient run and pool habitat with exposed gravels present in the runs and fines occurring in the pool areas. The distribution of pool to run habitat is approximately 1/1 along the length of the lower section. There is approximately 3,920 m2 of wetted area in the lower section of WC2 suggesting that there is approximately 1960 m2 of run habitat that may be suitable for spawning, based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth. During the 13 November 2016 spawner survey chum salmon were observed to be spawning in the available run habitat present in the lower section of the channel (Figure 1, 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat).</p> <p>The Fish Habitat Offset Plan proposes to create more than 5,000 m2 of additional groundwater-fed channel habitat with approximately a 1/1 ration of pool to run habitat. The offset channel extension uses the design of the existing lower channel as a template so it is reasonable to expected that approximately 2,500 m2 of the new habitat will have conditions similar to the run habitat present in the existing channel where chum salmon where observed to be spawning.</p> <p>A 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat provides the results of 2016 spawner surveys for WC2 and a description of salmonid species utilization of habitat provided by groundwater-fed channels.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3024	633 - 21	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Even if Burnco make the best possible effort, there is no way they will be able to significantly mitigate the noise from loading millions of tonnes of aggregate into steel hulled barges. Noise and vibrations have been found to disturb large marine mammals' communication, navigation and food-finding abilities, and are increasingly believed to impact their fertility. Sadly, if Burnco is allowed to proceed with this mine, we can expect the dolphins, orcas, and grey whales to vacate the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3025	633 - 22	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	An artificial lake is not a reasonable remediation to replace the habitat for the displaced wildlife.	<p>The pit lake is not proposed as mitigation for habitat loss. Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
3026	633 - 23	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	We find it difficult to believe that there will be no audible impact from the project on the north end of Gambier Island. Given the natural topography of the area and the fact that noise travels very clearly across water we have significant concerns about the noise of the barge loading in particular which we believe will have a significant negative impact of the peaceful nature of the area for humans as well as for marine and terrestrial life. While talking to representatives from Golder at the Open House in West Vancouver in September 2016 it became clear that the noise impact had been modelled with little firsthand knowledge of the area impacted; the lead representative on noise impact admitted he had never been onsite.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3027	633 - 24	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	The noise values expected from the Golder models were considered to be acceptable to urban and industrial settings; the study area is neither as it is primarily recreational.	<p>The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: “A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment.”</p> <p>McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.</p>
3028	633 - 25	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3029	633 - 26	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3030	633 - 27	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>A number of areas of the EIS identify possible environmental impacts of the project but allude to these being addressed by “best management practices”. There are significant concerns around approving a development with clear environmental risks based on the “hope” that best environmental practices will be adhered to. The resources available at the BCEAO for oversight of such projects seem fairly limited from a resource perspective (5-6 people cover the province). What is to stop the proponent from ignoring “best practise” and declining to follow mitigation strategies? The experience of residents adjacent to the Cougar Ridge Mine in Calgary, Alberta owned and operated by Burnco does not suggest that Burnco can be guaranteed to be a “good neighbour”.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3031	633 - 28	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Economic Impacts</p> <p>While the project will create 12 full time jobs, it will jeopardize far more jobs than that by impacting the tourism and film industries irreparably.</p> <p>BC FILM INDUSTRY</p> <p>The BC Film industry contributes \$1.3 billion annually to the BC economy. Crews regularly use Howe Sound to represent many world locales, as it provides the key ingredients of wilderness, breathtaking scenery, and easy access from Vancouver, and silence. The introduction of an open pit mine, gravel barge and crusher will dramatically diminish this appeal—making Vancouver itself a less convenient place to film a movie, since its nearby wilderness will no longer be viable for filming.</p> <p>In a 2012 letter to the Future of Howe Sound Society (FHSS) from Thierry Tanguy, a Unit and Location Manager, in Greater Vancouver's Film Industry, Thierry had this to say: "In the last few years, a number of projects have been filmed in the Squamish corridor, as opposed to the other regions we typically compete with, such as California and Louisiana, precisely because of the pristine beauty of its coastline. To name a specific example, I just finished working on a project entitled 'Horns' for Mandalay Pictures. ... originally slated to be filmed in Savannah, Georgia. The one element that shifted the interest in favour of British Columbia is the beauty of the Squamish corridor and Howe Sound where we ended up filming Two-Thirds of the project. This is Twenty-Million</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3032	633 - 29	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The mine will be visible from the Cypress ski area and Lions Bay, a popular hiking and rock-climbing destination. Every visitor headed to Squamish or Whistler on the Sea-to-Sky Highway and Sea-to-Sky Gondola, as well as daily sightseeing flights from downtown on Harbour Air and others, will see this once-stunning valley being rendered into a gravel mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3033	633 - 30	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p><b>Property Values</b> Property values along the Howe Sound have already been negatively impacted. The 16 vacation homes at McNab Creek and 53 recreational properties directly across the channel at Douglas Bay on Gambier Island will be the hardest hit due to the obvious eyesore, increased barge traffic, noise and loss of natural beauty. The reduction in property values which has already occurred since the mine was first proposed 6 years ago, harms not only residents, but municipal governments' tax base. Given the considerable increases in property values in the Lower Mainland in the last 6 years it is quite staggering that properties anywhere close to this proposed mine have seen a decline in both assessed value and potential resale value, as evidenced by recent land sales in the area.</p> <p>Vancouver-based Burrard and West Vancouver-based Thunderbird Yacht Clubs have outstations directly opposite the mine site. The 600 members will suffer loss of land value, and outstations will suffer from significantly diminished use.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
3034	633 - 31	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p><b>Social Impacts</b> Easy accessibility from Vancouver allows people across the lower mainland to enjoy wilderness on their doorstep. The impact of the mine will diminish Howe Sound for present and future generations, reducing Vancouver's much-vaunted "liveability."</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3035	633 - 32	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The immediate visual impact of the mine and crushing facilities has only been shown by the proponent at sea level. To understand the full visual impact an assessment from a higher elevation is needed. We believe that from a higher elevation the open pit mine and crushing facilities will be fully visible and have a further negative social and economic impact on the properties from which they are visible.</p>	<p>The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed, and it is a publicly accessible location that would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata. The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use.</p> <p>Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3036	633 - 33	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In the immediate vicinity of this proposed mine there are existing communities including McNab Creek Strata, Douglas Bay Strata, Brigade Bay, Burrard Yacht Club and Thunderbird Yacht Club. All of these communities enjoy the peace and tranquillity and abundant wildlife in this amazing section of Howe Sound. Families engage in all manner of sport and recreation including hiking, swimming, water sports, sailing, wind surfing, paddle boarding and kayaking. In addition numerous kids camps such as Potlach, Day Break, Artaban, Boys and Girls Club use this area for recreation and there are frequent excursions of kayakers in procession from these camps paddling by or visiting McNab Creek area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3037	633 - 34	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In its draft AIR Burnco committed to reporting on the status of consultations with private local land owners and tenure holders who will be affected by the project. However Volume 4, section 21 of the report shows little evidence that Burnco fulfilled these commitments. At section 21.2.4.1 – Social Communications the list of Personal Communications lacks engagement with the local stakeholders who will be impacted by the project. For instance, although Douglas Bay is the largest private land holding in the area and will be directly impacted if the project goes ahead no one from Burnco has attempted to contact the members of the Douglas Bay Strata.	The sample of key informants described in Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS (Non-traditional Land and Resource Use) was not intended to be exhaustive of all stakeholders potentially affected by the Proposed Project, but rather was intended to be wide ranging enough to confirm and expand on non-traditional land and resource use information available from the referenced secondary sources. Key informants interviewed or provided data for this report included representatives from recreational groups and tourism operators, as well as DFO and MFLNRO. Specifically key informants included:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Burrard Yacht Club</li> <li>- Coastal Inlet Adventures</li> <li>- DFO</li> <li>- Don's Water Taxi</li> <li>- Gambier Island Local Trust</li> <li>- Gibson Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>- Islands Trust</li> <li>- MFLNRO</li> <li>- Recreation Sites and Trails BC</li> <li>- Sewell's Marina</li> <li>- Squamish Yacht Club</li> <li>- Sunshine Kayaks</li> <li>- Thunderbird Yacht Club</li> </ul> Conditions C-5.1 through C-5.3 (Table 19.1) outlines the Proponent commitment to ongoing engagement with the McNab Creek Strata. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. BURNCO has also proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3038	633 - 35	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In conclusion we cannot see how the joint goals of environmental, social and economic sustainability for Howe Sound can be achieved if this project is allowed to go ahead. We can only trust in the process and believe that our public servants and government will recognize that the value of McNab Creek and the whole Howe Sound region outweighs the business needs of one Alberta based company.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3039	633 - 36	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	If the project should go ahead we need to ensure that there are stringent conditions (including multi-million dollar environmental bonds) attached to its approval which are closely monitored on an ongoing basis by an independent third party and to ensure that the scope of the operation does not extend beyond that described in the EIS. A robust monitoring and safeguard system needs to be in place to ensure the commitments in this application are followed through and that Burnco is held accountable should the need arise.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3040	633 - 37	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Finally we suggest that Burnco is required to grant restrictive covenants in favour of the landowners surrounding the proposed project to ensure that the commitments and assurances given in the approval process are effectively monitored and enforced.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3041	634 - 1	Chris Gordon	Port Coquitlam, BC	Howe Sound is doing so well, thanks to the efforts of environmentally concerned citizens taking action. Please don't allow this mine to proceed and set back all the hard work done to date. We don't need it, we don't want it.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3042	635 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gambier Island, BC	I am a long time resident of Gambier Island and I absolutely oppose this project. I resent having to spend time on this, since it should not even be considered due to complete incompatibility with the ecological and social values present. Please put an end to this.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3043	636 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	Please reject the Burnco Aggregate Project application. There is no benefit to the local community, only loss of quality of life from noise and industrial activity	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3044	636 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	Please reject the Burnco Aggregate Project application. There is no benefit to the local community, only loss of quality of life from noise and industrial activity	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3045	636 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
3046	636 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3047	636 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3048	636 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
3049	636 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3050	636 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	<p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3051	636 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	<p>Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3052	636 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area only diminish it.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3053	636 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Port Moody, BC	The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area only diminish it.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3054	637 - 1	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	The Burrard Yacht Club has owned 15 acres at Ekins Point on the north end of Gambier Island for roughly 25 years where our family oriented boating club has built and maintained a large Outstation (marine moorage facility) located directly across Thornborough Channel from the proposed BURNCO McNab Valley Aggregate Mine. This property is well used year round by the families of our 380+ members (5,500 man-days annually) who will be directly detrimentally affected by the proposed BURNCO McNab Valley Aggregate Mine. Our concerns that do not appear to have been correctly addressed within Burnco's Project Application documents are:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3055	637 - 2	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	References to Long Term Industrial Use in the McNab Valley: BURNCO's proposal comments that heavy industry has previously taken place in the McNab Valley over many decades and therefore their project should also be allowed and approved is misleading. Logging is a Primary Industry that has historically taken place intermittently throughout the McNab Valley over many decades harvesting the renewable forest resources. These operations have created employment and bolstered the provincial economy while creating temporary disturbance where forest regrowth has taken place in the valley within a few years. In recent years the size of the forest tenure cut-blocks have been reduced and the resulting detrimental effects have been reduced in both size and duration.  Conversely the proposed Burnco McNab Valley Aggregate Mine would be a Secondary "Processing" Industry that would operate continuously in one (1) fixed location close to local stakeholders, a minimum of 10 hours per day, 5 days per week, 52 weeks per year, over the next 15-20 years.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3056	637 - 3	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	This continuous prolonged Secondary industry will have a far more detrimental permanent effect on local stakeholders than the previous Primary logging industry while permanently altering the habitat by forever removing a large portion of the McNab Valley alluvial fan leaving in its place a large water filled pit/pond. These are definitely two (2) distinctly different degrees of industrialization in this natural rural environment.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3057	637 - 4	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	This continuous prolonged Secondary industry will have a far more detrimental permanent effect on local stakeholders than the previous Primary logging industry while permanently altering the habitat by forever removing a large portion of the McNab Valley alluvial fan leaving in its place a large water filled pit/pond. These are definitely two (2) distinctly different degrees of industrialization in this natural rural environment.	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3058	637 - 5	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise Impacts:</p> <p>Based upon our many years of experience at this location, the noise level mapping provided within the proponent's application appears to be questionable. Low level noise currently created by periodic use of the log dump and booming grounds at the base of the McNab Valley are clearly heard across Thornborough Channel. As this log handling background noise is relatively subdued, temporary, and in keeping with historical usage it is accepted. However additional industrial noise created by the proposed BURNCO mine and barge loading terminal operating a minimum of ten (10) hours per day, (5) days per week, 52 weeks per year, over the next 15-20 years will have a long term detrimental effect on the use and enjoyment of this area by the long term property owners and recreational visitors using this area in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3059	637 - 6	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Noise Impacts: Based upon our many years of experience at this location, the noise level mapping provided within the proponent's application appears to be questionable. Low level noise currently created by periodic use of the log dump and booming grounds at the base of the McNab Valley are clearly heard across Thornborough Channel. As this log handling background noise is relatively subdued, temporary, and in keeping with historical usage it is accepted. However additional industrial noise created by the proposed BURNCO mine and barge loading terminal operating a minimum of ten (10) hours per day, (5) days per week, 52 weeks per year, over the next 15-20 years will have a long term detrimental effect on the use and enjoyment of this area by the long term property owners and recreational visitors using this area in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3060	637 - 7	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Increased Marine Traffic Impacts: Concerns are noted in the application regarding the ongoing safety of recreational boaters in Thornborough Channel from increased commercial tug and barge traffic in the area. However, if the proposed terminal location goes ahead there is no mention of concern for the safety of the many docks and/or vessels securely moored in the surrounding area (up to 50 boats at our facilities alone). Increased tug and water taxi traffic in Thornborough Channel will have a significant detrimental effect on the safe ongoing use of our dock facilities located at Ekins Point. All it takes is one (1) commercial tug or water taxi coming or going too fast from the BURNCO terminal to create a very significant wake that could result in safety issues and/or personal injuries, along with significant damage to both the moored vessels and/or the dock facilities. Although we currently have substantial breakwaters at our Ekins Point Outstation this is a very real event that could occur many times over the projected 15-20 year life of the project. Has such an event been discussed with BURNCO and who will be responsible and/or liable for any damages and/or the costs of increased maintenance to our facilities associated with the additional marine traffic servicing the proposed project over the next 16 years?</p> <p>To help mitigate the previously noted concerns would it be feasible to relocate the proposed Barge Loading Terminal into the existing area currently zoned for Secondary Industry at Port Mellon to be fed by conveyors from the mine site. This area around Port Mellon is relatively uninhabited due to its long term Secondary Industrial use</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3061	637 - 8	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Socio-Economic Impacts: Yes, the proposed BURNCO Project may create up to 8-12 full time jobs along with a debatable number of spin-off jobs but permitting this continuous Secondary Industry in this growing rural environment will seriously damage the area's future prosperity including residential, recreational, and eco-tourism growth, along with hundreds of spin-off jobs, and taxable property values.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3062	637 - 9	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Socio-Economic Impacts: Yes, the proposed BURNCO Project may create up to 8-12 full time jobs along with a debatable number of spin-off jobs but permitting this continuous Secondary Industry in this growing rural environment will seriously damage the area's future prosperity including residential, recreational, and eco-tourism growth, along with hundreds of spin-off jobs, and taxable property values.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3063	637 - 10	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	<p>As one (1) small example of the direct economic benefits of recreational use in this area, the Burrard Yacht Club's current contribution to the Sunshine Coast Regional District is roughly \$ 235,000.00 / year. This type of recreational economic input will be significantly reduced if the proposed BURNCO Open Pit/Pond Aggregate Mine is approved. Current and future residential and recreational users will simply decide to spend their leisure time and dollars elsewhere versus going to this area of Howe Sound, where industrial re-growth appears to be favoured over the previously promoted natural recreation and residential usage in this area of the Sea to Sky Corridor.</p> <p>This area of Howe Sound is a highly valued natural resource to the current local stakeholders, communities, and government bodies, who have collectively invested a lot more time and money in this area over a far longer period than BURNCO Rock Products has within only the last few years.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3064	637 - 11	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	The chief benefactor of this project over the next 15-20 years will be a single vertically integrated Alberta based company, Burnco Rock Products, but approving this project will have serious long term negative impacts on the local property owners and communities who have maintained the economy, created jobs, paid taxes, and helped to stimulate the ongoing environmental recovery in this area.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3065	637 - 12	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	The chief benefactor of this project over the next 15-20 years will be a single vertically integrated Alberta based company, Burnco Rock Products, but approving this project will have serious long term negative impacts on the local property owners and communities who have maintained the economy, created jobs, paid taxes, and helped to stimulate the ongoing environmental recovery in this area.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge fro Treat Creek (eas of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
3066	637 - 13	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	There are currently other commercially available sources of aggregate on the BC coast and another open pit gravel mine / rock crushing operation in this area of Howe Sound is simply not the best use of these valuable natural resources.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3067	637 - 14	Lea Bancroft	North Vancouver, BC	How do you put a value on this easily accessed quiet natural "escape" environment that is now becoming a very rare and desirable commodity in such close proximity to the growing world class city of Vancouver?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3068	638 - 1	Kate Thomas-Peter	Bowen Island, BC	I live in Howe Sound on Bowen Island. The Sound has relatively recently shown signs of recovery from previous pollution sources. It is a jewel of nature so close to a major city, giving access to nature for millions of people, the benefits of which are well documented for physical, mental and spiritual health. It should be a protected area with great caution over agreeing to mines or quarries that are both a blot on the landscape and a potential source of pollution. Please do not grant permission for this gravel pit.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3069	639 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I am concerned for the wildlife and decisions the government is making. Keep Howe sound clean. We don't want LNG or gravel mine.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3070	640 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	PLEASE don't build a gravel pit mine in any of the estuaries of Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3071	640 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	One Hundred and ninety acres is huge and disrupts (eliminates) one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound. The Squamish River estuary is contaminated with Mercury and will remain so.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3072	640 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Who will defend the voiceless creatures that depend on this habitat ... this represents serious concerns as it is a high risk to Salmon and will limit access to bears and elk etc. What of the spotted owl ? It will create the noise and light pollution.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3073	640 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Who will defend the voiceless creatures that depend on this habitat ... this represents serious concerns as it is a high risk to Salmon and will limit access to bears and elk etc. What of the spotted owl ? It will create the noise and light pollution.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3074	640 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Who will defend the voiceless creatures that depend on this habitat ... this represents serious concerns as it is a high risk to Salmon and will limit access to bears and elk etc. What of the spotted owl ? It will create the noise and light pollution.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3075	640 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Who will defend the voiceless creatures that depend on this habitat ... this represents serious concerns as it is a high risk to Salmon and will limit access to bears and elk etc. What of the spotted owl ? It will create the noise and light pollution.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3076	640 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Who will defend the voiceless creatures that depend on this habitat ... this represents serious concerns as it is a high risk to Salmon and will limit access to bears and elk etc. What of the spotted owl ? It will create the noise and light pollution.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3077	640 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Pristine estuaries are rare ... gravel can be obtained elsewhere. Please do not allow this.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
3078	640 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3079	641 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Please do not commence with s gravel pit mine in Mcnab creek.	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3080	641 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound is finally coming back ecologically from years of damage by big business.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3081	641 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I live here. I love boating , swimming and enjoy watching the seals and whales.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3082	641 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	I live here. I love boating , swimming and enjoy watching the seals and whales. The impact to the smaller sea life ..salmon could be a disaster. Please. No.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3083	642 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	This would threaten the existing tourism industry, and the recovering environment for wildlife.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3084	642 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	This would threaten the existing tourism industry, and the recovering environment for wildlife.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3085	642 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	The whales and others are returning. This is more important to the future of the area than any extraction industry.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3086	642 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	The whales and others are returning. This is more important to the future of the area than any extraction industry.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3087	642 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	West Vancouver, BC	The whales and others are returning. This is more important to the future of the area than any extraction industry.	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3088	643 - 1	She Ronson	Vancouver, BC	Please do not destroy this important salmon habitat and beautiful piece of the BC coast for a gravel pit.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3089	643 - 2	She Ronson	Vancouver, BC	The world does not need more concrete but it does need more fish and wildlife.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3090	643 - 3	She Ronson	Vancouver, BC	The world does not need more concrete but it does need more fish and wildlife.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3091	643 - 4	She Ronson	Vancouver, BC	Be an ecologically responsible company instead & choose ethics over dollars. In your hearts you know this is right.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3092	644 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	no to pollution and development.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3093	645 - 1	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	The attached letter contains comments from the Future of Howe Sound Society.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3094	645 - 2	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Re: Proposed Burnco Aggregate Project at McNab Creek, British Columbia - CEA Registry Reference Number 11-03-54754</p> <p>We are writing in response to your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement filed with your office by Burnco Rock Products Ltd. regarding the Burnco Aggregate Project proposed for McNab Creek, Howe Sound, British Columbia.</p> <p>Our Society is committed to the conservation and stewardship of Howe Sound for the benefit of current and future generations. Having reviewed the EA application, supporting documents and attended the public information sessions, it seems clear to us that there would be significant social, health, environmental and economic harm caused by this project which cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3095	645 - 3	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Burnco's Environmental Impact Statement is largely focussed on specific, localized impacts at the proposed site but ignores or fails to adequately address the socio-economic and environmental impacts on the greater Howe Sound region. Any decision on this project should not be based on the proponent's constrained review of the environmental and socio-economic issues in the immediate area of the proposed project but must take into account the greater impact the proposed project could have on the Howe Sound region.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3096	645 - 4	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Burnco's Environmental Impact Statement is largely focussed on specific, localized impacts at the proposed site but ignores or fails to adequately address the socio-economic and environmental impacts on the greater Howe Sound region. Any decision on this project should not be based on the proponent's constrained review of the environmental and socio-economic issues in the immediate area of the proposed project but must take into account the greater impact the proposed project could have on the Howe Sound region.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3097	645 - 5	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	The proponent's report shows little effort by the proponent to have engaged in discussion with neighbouring communities or other stakeholders to assess the adverse impact that this project would have on those stakeholders.	Phone based interviews are cited as personal communications (pers.comm.) within the text of the EAC Application/EIS and details included in the references (Part G, Section 21). The list of key informants included the following: Burrard Yacht Club, Coastal Inlet Adventures, District of Squamish, Don's Water Taxi, Gambier Island Local Trust, Gibsons and District Chamber of Commerce, Gibsons Landing Inn, Irwin Motel, Islands Trust, McNab Creek Strata, Sewell's Marina, Squamish Yacht Club, Sunshine Kayaking, Thunderbird Yacht Club, Recreation Sites and Trails BC and West Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services.
3098	645 - 6	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	There is little or no recent assessment of how this project would impact other initiatives for long term planning or sustainable development.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3099	645 - 7	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	There is no objective assessment on the impact this project could have on the tourism and film industries or other economic drivers for the region.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3100	645 - 8	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Much of the reference material is outdated or deficient and cumulative effects assessment is deficient in many areas.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3101	645 - 9	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The adverse socio-economic impact that this type of industrial activity could have on the region should not be underestimated. Both the Provincial and Federal Governments have spent considerable energy and taxpayer funds in promoting the Sea-to-Sky corridor as an international tourist destination primarily with an emphasis on what it offers for eco-tourism and recreation. The number of tourist visits to the Sea to Sky Corridor has increased dramatically over the last few years and contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to the local economy. The development of a mine project such as this with the attendant impact on a fragile eco-system as well as noise, dust and light pollution can only be detrimental to these efforts to promote the area as a tourist destination. It will have serious, adverse economic consequences to other communities, businesses and users of the Sound. The EIS is lacking in its assessment of impacts on the tourism and recreation economy of the region.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3102	645 - 10	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The adverse socio-economic impact that this type of industrial activity could have on the region should not be underestimated. Both the Provincial and Federal Governments have spent considerable energy and taxpayer funds in promoting the Sea-to-Sky corridor as an international tourist destination primarily with an emphasis on what it offers for eco-tourism and recreation. The number of tourist visits to the Sea to Sky Corridor has increased dramatically over the last few years and contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to the local economy. The development of a mine project such as this with the attendant impact on a fragile eco-system as well as noise, dust and light pollution can only be detrimental to these efforts to promote the area as a tourist destination. It will have serious, adverse economic consequences to other communities, businesses and users of the Sound. The EIS is lacking in its assessment of impacts on the tourism and recreation economy of the region.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3103	645 - 11	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>In September 2002, twelve local governments and First Nations representing the communities in the Sea to Sky corridor signed Principles of Co-operation which identified the importance of community involvement in the consideration of issues affecting Howe Sound and the need to “work together for the greater good because territorial lines on a map mean nothing in terms of sustainability”. Among other principles identified in the document, the signatories recognized the “need to effectively manage and maintain a balanced relationship between community development and the protection of unique biophysical qualities of the region”. Recently, these communities have re-affirmed the need to proceed with a comprehensive planning process for the region.</p> <p>The proposed processing facility is not permitted under current zoning. The fact that a proposal of this nature is being considered through an independent governmental assessment without any comprehensive land use plan having been developed for Howe Sound in spite of the stated desires of the communities and local governments in the area is astounding. Furthermore, initiatives are underway to pursue a marine or national park and to have the Howe Sound region recognized as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. The federal and provincial governments should be taking a leadership role to ensure that proper land use planning is undertaken prior to considering major industrial development proposals which can have dramatic socio-economic impacts on the surrounding region. In the absence of a comprehensive resource management plan, the Provincial Government should not be approving a project which is</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3104	645 - 12	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The significant adverse environmental impacts of a project of this nature have previously been considered and determined to be unacceptable by the Department of Fisheries and Ocean on at least two prior occasions before the current proposal. The proponent was well aware of the fact this project is not permitted under current zoning and of the fundamental concerns about the impact on fish habitat and on the Howe Sound region as a whole before it embarked on seeking approval for the pit mine.</p> <p>There is overwhelming opposition to this proposal through the Howe Sound community and beyond due to the significant adverse impact this project would have if approved. This is not a situation where the proponent could be deprived of existing property rights. The proponent has elected to take a calculated risk in undertaking its application for approval of this project notwithstanding its prior knowledge of the fundamental concerns the project raises and the fact that existing zoning does not permit its intended use.</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3105	645 - 13	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>Environmental Impact</p> <p>1. The Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared based on a project scope that has been substantially scaled back from Burnco's original proposal. The assessments that have been conducted are based on underlying assumptions as to both the scale of the project and the hours of operation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project life has been reduced from 20-30 years to 16 years, and the maximum depth of excavation has been reduced from 55 metres to 35 metres;</li> <li>- There are no proposed discharges to, or withdrawals from, McNab Creek;</li> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Reduced the size of the pit lake as the northern edge has been moved away from the McNab Creek Flood Protection Dyke.</li> <li>- Pit lake designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. The elevation of the pit lake will also be used to manage base flows in the natural groundwater watercourses below the pit lake.</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Areas progressively reclaimed during the operational phase will be re-vegetated to control erosion.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> <li>- Replaced wash water sedimentation ponds and associated discharges with a 95% efficient wash plant that uses recycled water from two large storage tanks. The 5% loss (via retention, evaporation and absorption) will be supplemented with make-up water from a ground water well. No wash water will be discharged.</li> <li>- Fines generated from the crushing, screening, washing of material will be extracted from the wash water and mechanically dried and compressed into sediment cakes which will be used in progressive reclamation of the onsite fines disposal area.</li> <li>- Covered or enclosed Project components and/or operating under wet conditions (e.g., fine water spray) to reduced potential</li> </ul>
3106	645 - 14	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>However at the 2013 a Burnco senior executive stated that it was their long-term intention to expand the mine even beyond what had been proposed at that time. We have significant concerns about relying on the results of environmental assessments which are predicated on these assumptions of a reduced scope of operations since Burnco has clearly expressed its desire and intention to ultimately develop a substantially larger mine which will be operated 24 hours per day. We remain concerned that the scope of the project as described in the EIS has been contrived for the purposes of achieving initial approval and because the Environmental Impact Statement relies on the assumptions as to project scope, it does not properly assess the ultimate impact that this project will have if approved.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3107	645 - 15	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	However at the 2013 a Burnco senior executive stated that it was their long-term intention to expand the mine even beyond what had been proposed at that time. We have significant concerns about relying on the results of environmental assessments which are predicated on these assumptions of a reduced scope of operations since Burnco has clearly expressed its desire and intention to ultimately develop a substantially larger mine which will be operated 24 hours per day. We remain concerned that the scope of the project as described in the EIS has been contrived for the purposes of achieving initial approval and because the Environmental Impact Statement relies on the assumptions as to project scope, it does not properly assess the ultimate impact that this project will have if approved.	The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.
3108	645 - 16	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	2. Even based on the questionable assumptions of project scope, the EIS is deficient and fails to properly assess the overall impact of this Project. An independent professional review of the EIS conducted by LGL Limited, Environmental Research Associates, (a copy of which has been submitted under separate cover) has identified a number of key deficiencies and concludes by stating: "it is our professional opinion that the BURNCO Aggregate Project EAC application did not effectively address potential adverse residual and cumulative effects to marine resources, recreational values and land management. We recommend that the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office, in its environmental assessment report, conclude that the project will cause significant environmental effects."	BURNCO prepared a Technical Memo response to comments provided by the Future of Howe Sound Society in a letter to Ruth Simons (Executive Director) from LGL Limited dated September 27, 2016 titled Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project. See 10-Jan-2017 Technical Memo entitled 'Response to Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project'.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3109	645 - 17	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>3. We are concerned that the various aspects of the EIS assessment have been prepared in isolation and that this compartmentalized approach has not provided a proper evaluation of the overall impact of the project. For example, at the recent Open House, the air quality presentation showed an air particulate coverage area that extended well out into the surrounding marine environment. When asked to explain the visual presentation, the air quality consultant advised that the coverage area was an averaged overview of the area that would be impacted and there would be times (particularly during the ongoing periods of surface construction activity as the pit area is expanded which are expected to occur at least annually) when the particulate coverage area would be larger than shown on the presentation. When asked to explain how the marine impact assessment could be predicated on the hypothesis that there would be no sediment created by the project even though the air quality analysis showed an expansive area that would be exposed to particulates which would necessarily settle over the marine area, the air quality consultant indicated that she was not aware of any exchange of data or cross-evaluation between the consultant groups to confirm whether the working hypothesis used in the marine assessment that there would be no sediment created was reasonable or correct. Based on the air quality consultant's projections about air quality impacts and actual impacts at other aggregate loading locations, we suggest that the hypothesis used in the marine assessment that that there will be no sediment impacting the marine area cannot be substantiated and is contradicted by the EIS's own air particulate assessment.</p>	<p>The air quality dispersion model predictions presented in Figures 5.7-2, 5.7-3, 5.7-4 and 5.7-5 represent in-air concentrations of particulate matter fractions and not predictions of dust deposition; the concentrations presented do not represent dust plumes. In addition, the dispersion modelling methods and associated assumptions - approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) - incorporated a high degree of conservatism. The air dispersion model was based on worst case daily emission rates and assumed worst case daily emissions every day of the year. These assumptions contributed to the high level of confidence in the air quality assessment predictions that there will no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The same Ministry-approved CALPUFF model that was used to predict air quality concentrations (i.e., run in dynamic [3D] mode with a fine resolution meteorological data set) was used to predict deposition rates which were incorporated into the surface water quality model and the assessment of potential effects on water quality and aquatic health. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3110	645 - 18	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>4. The information included in the EIS does not appear to substantiate the claim that there will be no sediment impact on marine life and the air quality assessments seem to indicate the contrary. The recent discoveries by the Vancouver Aquarium's Howe Sound Research Group of important reefs in the very near vicinity to the loading area and of other sponge reefs in the near vicinity make a more extensive review of potential sediment impacts imperative. Sponge reefs are extremely sensitive to sediment and these extremely rare and very fragile areas must be properly protected. The analysis provided by Burnco does not properly address the potential impact on the nearby sponge reefs. The assumption that there will be no sediment created is very questionable and there should be further studies to assess what impact there would be if dust and other particulates are created (whether during dredging, storage or loading) which seems to be a much more likely event than the assumed case.</p>	<p>Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.</p>
3111	645 - 19	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>5. The EIS provided seems to be confined to the immediate impact on McNab Creek and the existing compensation channel. However, this location is one of the few areas in Howe Sound which is shallow enough to serve as a natural feeding and habitat area for marine life and serves as a staging area for salmon returning to other locations in Howe Sound, including the Squamish River. There appears to be no assessment of what impact the destruction of the estuary will have on salmon returning to the Squamish River or on forage fish and other fish stock which use the surrounding marine area for feeding. The baseline studies that were conducted were very limited in scope and did not cover seasonal periods and do not properly assess the migratory patterns of marine life in the area and the impact that the project could have on these populations.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3112	645 - 20	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	6. Some of the baseline assessments used for various components of the EIS seem to be of questionable validity for the project location. For example, the baseline data for Air Quality was derived from data collected at Langdale, Squamish and Horseshoe Bay, all of which are urban areas with significant vehicular traffic and other factors affecting air quality. The air quality in a remote location such as McNab Creek can reasonably be expected to differ significantly from urban areas and it is unclear why an air quality monitoring station was not established at the site to provide accurate baseline data.	<p>The ambient air particulate monitoring data collected at the Proposed Project site during the month of November was not used to characterize the existing air quality. Instead, background air quality concentrations for TSP, PM10, PM2.5, NO2 and SO2 were characterized using data from existing air quality monitoring networks operated by the BC Ministry of Environment (BC MoE). Background air quality concentrations were established using methods consistent with the BC Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Guideline current at the time of assessment (BC MoE 2008). The method used to determine background concentrations was approved by the BC MoE within the detailed model plan, included in the EAC Application/EIS as Appendix 5.7-E.</p> <p>The most recent available data from the BC MoE at the time of the assessment was used to establish background conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the Langdale Elementary station PM10, NO2 and SO2 data were available between January 2010 and December 2013 and data for PM2.5 were available between December 2011 and December 2013.</li> <li>- For the Squamish station PM10 data were only available between January 2010 and January 2011, while PM2.5 data were available between February 2011 and December 2013. Data for NO2 and SO2 were available between January 2010 and December 2013.</li> <li>- For the Horseshoe Bay station PM2.5 data were available between January 2011 and December.</li> </ul> <p>Similarly, the total dustfall results collected at the Proposed Project site were not used to support the application. The metals composition within the dustfall sample was used to support the human health assessment.</p>
3113	645 - 21	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	7. The EIS indicates that no adverse impact on groundwater or adverse run-off effects are expected and claims that the resultant pit lake will be benign and contribute to the ecosystem. However in one point in the analysis, the study suggests that the existing compensation channel acts like a wick drawing water in its direction. There is no explanation as to why a huge pit lake will not have a similar, but hugely exacerbated impact, and act as a gigantic sponge absorbing water from the surrounding groundwater resources.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>In the first year of mining, the portion of the WC 2 within the pit lake area would be deactivated by constructing a plug immediately adjacent to the pit. This will enable the pit lake groundwater recharge to re-establish and maintain natural groundwater levels. Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure.</p>
3114	645 - 22	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	8. The study also includes a conclusion that there is little liquefaction risk. This conclusion would appear to be at odds with a number of earthquake studies that highlight the potential risks in areas of sand and gravel which have a significant liquefaction risk. It is hard to understand how there would not be significant concern that a narrow strip of gravel and sand separating a large pit lake and the ocean would not be subject to liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. If this occurs, there presumably would be a significant interchange of the pit lake water and the foreshore. The analysis of this risk appears to be lacking and given that this area is in a high earthquake risk zone, that appears to be a significant omission.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project. The potential for damage or loss of proposed on-shore and marine facilities associated with the earthquake-related ground shaking, soil liquefaction-induced loss of strength and foundation support, lateral spreading movements and potential ground surface ruptures from faulting at depth have been considered in Volume 3, Part D, Section 14 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects of earthquakes on the project consider seismic events that might occur throughout the region including local events. Existing earthquake data are used to assess seismic hazard, including potential earthquakes associated with the Cascadia Subduction zone.</p> <p>The pit lake containment berm will be designed and built to appropriate design criteria, which include seismic stability considerations.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3115	645 - 23	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>9. There also appears to be little analysis of the impact of climate change and the rising level of the ocean. This project will permanently alter the estuary with only a low elevation strip of land between the pit lake and the ocean. If ocean levels rise as almost universally predicted, what will be the risk of the pit lake and ocean intersecting or the low elevation separation being breached?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential effects of future sea-level rise are addressed in Section 5.8.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted RSP2100 (sea-level height by 2100 relative to 2007 levels) using the mean sea-level rise was 18 cm, with a possible range of 6 to 30 cm. The predicted RSL2100 using the high predicted sea-level rise was 88 cm, with a possible range of 57 to 118 cm.</p> <p>Since the Proposed Project is expected to be completed by 2035 it is expected that rising sea levels of this amount will have little direct impact on the Proposed Project operation phase. The Proposed Project closure plan consists of removing surface infrastructure and site reclamation including a ground and surface water-fed lake (the pit lake), and therefore it is expected that the predicted rising sea level will have little impact on Proposed Project closure. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
3116	645 - 24	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>10. The EIS does not include any substantive assessment of potential concerns about acid rock drainage. Acid rock drainage was a significant contributor to the environmental damage caused at the Britannia Mine. Remediation of the problems caused by this acid rock drainage cost taxpayers in excess of \$50 million. Acid rock drainage is caused by natural oxidization when sulphide minerals are exposed to water and air. It is logical to assume that the geology of the McNab Valley could very well be similar to the Britannia Creek valley and it is our understanding that an assessment report from a survey conducted in the McNab Valley in 1980 indicates the presence of significant quantities of sulphide rock. Burnco is proposing to mine and crush this rock at its McNab Creek project. The mining and crushing activities will necessarily expose sulphide materials to water and air and create the precise conditions that resulted in the damage at Britannia Creek. It is very difficult to rationalize how Burnco can assert that their proposed activities will not have any adverse (if not disastrous) impact on the McNab Creek environment or have any confidence that the resultant pit lake will not be filled with acid rock run-off that is toxic to fish and aquatic life.</p>	<p>Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.</p> <p>Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material's potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.</p> <p>The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3117	645 - 25	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>11. The EIS acknowledges that there will be a “temporary” loss of riparian ecosystem and wetland ecosystem as a result of the project. However this is rationalized by stating that “re-establishment to current conditions is expect to occur within 150 years”. There is no substantive explanation of why this “temporary” loss of riparian and wetland areas which are critical to the ecosystem will not have a lasting detrimental effect on the McNab Valley.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement (including new riparian ecosystem and amphibian ponds), progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3118	645 - 26	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>12. The McNab Creek watershed is known for extreme rain fall and is identified as a high velocity stream yet the EIS Summary states that “It is unlikely that there is a significant potential for debris flows and debris floods to occur upstream of the Proposed Project Area”. It is difficult to rationalize this conclusion in light of the known characteristics of the valley. There seems to be no critical assessment of the potential flooding risks associated with unusual storm level activity and upstream debris blockage. In a natural delta and estuary, the flooding risk is naturally compensated by the delta fan however the construction of the sediment laden pit lake adjacent to the creek should raise significant concerns about flood potential yet this seems to be dismissed without any substantive evaluation.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3119	645 - 27	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	13. The EIS acknowledges that there will be loss of various bird habitat particularly during the operational phases but concludes in a number of instances that populations are predicted to recover after reclamation is completed. However those predictions of recovery do not appear to be supported by any concrete analysis that shows evidence of self-sustaining populations of bird species which can withstand the loss of habitat for a minimum of 30 years before reclamation is undertaken so that there is a surviving population that can allow for recovery.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3120	645 - 28	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	14. The EIS appears to make no mention of the possible effects on the Christie Islet Migratory Bird Sanctuary which is in close proximity to the proposed project site and immediately adjacent to the proposed barge route. It seems to be a startling omission that the potential impacts on the Christie Islet Bird Sanctuary are not even addressed.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential marine resource effects of the Proposed Project - including Marine Birds - is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Christie Islet is shown on Figure 7.2-5 and is located outside the Marine Transportation RSA.</p>
3121	645 - 29	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	15. The analysis of the noise impacts is predicated on evaluation standards associated with industrial activity or urban locations. These threshold tests are not appropriate for this location. The McNab Valley is at the heart of one of the prime recreation areas in the Lower Mainland. Visitors and residents of the area are attracted to the location due to its natural beauty and tranquility.	<p>The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: “A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment.”</p> <p>McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.</p>
3122	645 - 30	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Youth’s camps in the immediate vicinity introduce urban youth to wilderness environments.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation effects - including youth camps - are considered in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3123	645 - 31	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	To quantify the impact that the project will have on the local environment by reference to industrial or urban testing standards ignores the fundamental reason that people are drawn to the location. Background noise levels that may be acceptable in urban or industrial environments will destroy the fundamental nature of this location and so the assessment methodology does not seem appropriate for the location in question.	<p>In the absence of relevant existing or approved industrial facilities, the Commission Guideline mandates the use of specific Ambient Specific Levels (ASL) values to represent Baseline Case noise levels. The Commission Guideline discusses the use of an Ambient Monitoring Adjustment (Section 2.3.4 of the Guideline), when the ASL's are not thought to be representative of the actual sound environment. The only two cases where it may be necessary to consider an ambient monitoring adjustment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Areas considered to be pristine; and</li> <li>■ Areas with non-energy industrial activity that would influence the background noise levels.</li> </ul> <p>The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: "A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment."</p> <p>McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.</p> <p>Although there is industrial activity in the area, it does not cause the baseline noise levels to exceed the Commission Guideline ASL's, and therefore the ambient monitoring correction is not used. As such, for the noise assessment based on the Commission Guideline, Baseline Case noise levels at relevant receptors were established based on the ASL values specified in the Commission Guideline.</p> <p>The HC Guidance indicates that Baseline Case noise levels should be established through field measurements. As such, for the noise assessment based on the HC Guidance, the Baseline Case noise levels at relevant receptors were established based on field measurements conducted in the summer of 2012 and fall of 2013 at five representative receptors within the LSA and RSA. Noise from birds, insects, and other animal activities very near the monitoring location was considered not representative of normal conditions at the monitoring locations and was removed as recommended in Directive 038. Other sources not considered representative of normal conditions were: technician activities, vehicular traffic near the monitoring location, airplane flyovers, rain, and thunder.</p>
3124	645 - 32	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Additionally, from a review of the references, there appears to have been no effort undertaken to contact film industry representatives to assess what the noise, visual and dust impacts will have on the use of the area for filming.	Phone based interviews are cited as personal communications (pers.comm.) within the text of the EAC Application/EIS and details included in the references (Part G, Section 21). The list of key informants included the following: Burrard Yacht Club, Coastal Inlet Adventures, District of Squamish, Don's Water Taxi, Gambier Island Local Trust, Gibsons and District Chamber of Commerce, Gibsons Landing Inn, Irwin Motel, Islands Trust, McNab Creek Strata, Sewell's Marina, Squamish Yacht Club, Sunshine Kayaking, Thunderbird Yacht Club, Recreation Sites and Trails BC and West Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services.
3125	645 - 33	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Additionally, from a review of the references, there appears to have been no effort undertaken to contact film industry representatives to assess what the noise, visual and dust impacts will have on the use of the area for filming.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3126	645 - 34	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Additionally, from a review of the references, there appears to have been no effort undertaken to contact film industry representatives to assess what the noise, visual and dust impacts will have on the use of the area for filming.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3127	645 - 35	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	Additionally, from a review of the references, there appears to have been no effort undertaken to contact film industry representatives to assess what the noise, visual and dust impacts will have on the use of the area for filming.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3128	645 - 36	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	16. The conclusion expressed in the EIS that there will be no cumulative impacts from noise appears to be fundamentally flawed. The consultant at the public information session was not aware the Box Canyon power generation site was in the same valley or was now in operation. He also acknowledged that there had been no assessment work undertaken of the cumulative impact that would result from the concurrent operation of the Burnco project and the Box Canyon power generation facility. If other activities in the immediate vicinity are not even taken into account, it is hard to understand how it can be asserted there will be no cumulative impacts.	<p>Cumulative effects due to noise were not assessed because the significance of the noise VC was Negligible, Not Significant. This approach to cumulative effects assessment is consistent with accepted EA practice in BC and Canada.</p> <p>The cumulative contribution of noise from the Box Canyon project is expected to be minimal, based on previous assessments of run-of-river projects (e.g. Narrows Inlet Hydro Project, 2012).</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3129	645 - 37	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	17. The EIS study on the visual impact seems to be predicated on monitoring stations that, with one exception, are at sea-level. The study does not seem to take into account the potential impact on neighbouring locations at elevation even though there are a number of adjacent recreational properties with dwelling sites at higher elevations that will be impacted visually by this project. The analysis of the visual impacts appears to be deficient.	The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed, and it is publically accessible location that would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata. The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use.  Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.
3130	645 - 38	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<b>Social and-Economic Factors</b> 18. Burnco has attempted to justify the proposed project by inferring that there is a limited supply of gravel and aggregate and that this project is necessary to meet construction demands in the Lower Mainland. However the fact is that gravel and aggregate are not scarce commodities. The Fraser Valley Regional District Aggregate Inventory Atlas identifies 87 high rated deposits in the region and suggests that there are sufficient identified sources of aggregate to meet demand for well over 100 years. These resources are available at a far lower environmental, social and economic cost than Burnco's proposal. This project is not required to meet the needs of the greater good, it is being proposed simply to benefit Burnco at a significant cost to the public at large. Burnco will reap all of the benefits while the rest of the Howe Sound community and the residents of the Lower Mainland bear the significant costs of the project.	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.
3131	645 - 39	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	19. The proponent points to the jobs that will be created as the economic justification for its proposal however it makes no attempt to analyze what jobs may be lost by the re-allocation of its supply source. Since it will only be changing its own internal supply of commodities that are otherwise plentiful and readily available, it may be that the net increase in jobs will be less than is suggested and perhaps negligible as the sources it previously used to meet its requirements will no longer be required.	The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.  The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3132	645 - 40	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	20. The EIS makes no attempt to quantify the potential economic impact on the established prawn fishery in the area even though the project can be expected to adversely impact the sustainability of the fishery. The McNab Creek area has been identified as having a prime rearing area for prawns. Due to the recent wasting disease that has decimated Howe Sound's starfish population resulting in an increase in sea urchins feeding on eel grass, juvenile prawn feeding areas are under stress with potential ramifications to the sustainability of the prawn population. The loss of rearing areas and impact on the prawn population due to this project and resultant impact on the prawn fishery has not been addressed in Burnco's submission.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3133	645 - 41	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	20. The EIS makes no attempt to quantify the potential economic impact on the established prawn fishery in the area even though the project can be expected to adversely impact the sustainability of the fishery. The McNab Creek area has been identified as having a prime rearing area for prawns. Due to the recent wasting disease that has decimated Howe Sound's starfish population resulting in an increase in sea urchins feeding on eel grass, juvenile prawn feeding areas are under stress with potential ramifications to the sustainability of the prawn population. The loss of rearing areas and impact on the prawn population due to this project and resultant impact on the prawn fishery has not been addressed in Burnco's submission.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3134	645 - 42	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	21. Howe Sound is an extraordinary natural environment that is less than an hour away from a major metropolitan centre. The recreational opportunities it affords for residents of Metro Vancouver are unparalleled. The proximity to Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky corridor is a key factor in Vancouver being ranked as one of the most livable cities in the world and leads to immigration and investment which contribute greatly to Metro Vancouver's economy. The creation of a pit mine in a prime estuary will degrade the area and could cause an adverse economic impact on the growing and thriving tourism economy. There has been no attempt to quantify this cost.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3135	645 - 43	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>22. The natural capital associated with this unique environment cannot be underestimated but has been ignored. In a recent study (M. Molnar 2015, Sound Investment: Measuring the Return on Howe Sound's Ecosystem Assets, David Suzuki Foundation) Howe Sound was assessed as having a natural capital value of up to \$4.7 billion. Yet the EIS makes no attempt to quantify the cost of the loss to Howe Sound's natural capital that would result if this project proceeds even though Burnco concedes that there will be significant environmental impacts in a number of areas and a degradation of valuable ecosystems. The Molnar study suggests that the annual value per hectare of ecosystem services in Howe Sound ranges from \$36,045 per hectare to \$624,879 per hectare. Based on these numbers, for the 70 hectares of lands that will be consumed by this project, the net economic cost to the general public through loss of natural capital will range from \$2,524,150 per year to \$44,041,530 per year. Even the median value of this range would indicate a cost to the public of \$23,453,340 per year. Since this project will be consuming the last largely intact estuary in the region, it is likely that the true economic cost to the public of this project will be at the upper end of the range and could well exceed \$40 million per year.</p>	<p>The loss of wildlife habitat was described using wildlife habitat suitability index models and habitat associations as described in Section 5.3.1.5 of Volume 2, Section 5.3. A detailed vegetation assessment and discussion on proposed Project effects to vegetation is described in Section 5.3.2, Volume 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>The trees and vegetation where the pit lake is planned will be permanently lost (28.2 ha). However, reclamation activities post-closure will re-establish mature forest on site. Roosevelt elk winter habitat will be restored through the creation of 24.3 ha of mature forest over approximately 25 years. In addition, a total of 31 ha of moderate to high suitability Roosevelt elk habitat (based on habitat suitability index modelling) to the north, east and south of the Project area will be protected and left unaffected by the Project. Establishing mature forest will also provide suitable habitat for other mature forest species such as northern goshawk and marbled murrelet. Therefore, the removal of trees to establish the pit lake will be compensated for.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3136	645 - 44	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>23. This project is being proposed at a time when the extensive environmental remediation efforts undertaken in Howe Sound over the last few decades have begun to show results. The success of these remediation efforts is evidenced by the recovery of marine life with increased herring runs and salmon returning to creeks that had historically been too polluted to support the fishery. Killer whales, humpback whales and other cetaceans have been sighted with increasing frequency in the last few years including in Ramilles Channel and Thornbrough Channel which are in the immediate vicinity of the project. The return of these marine mammals to Howe Sound is evidence of the recovery of the Howe Sound environment which has been accomplished at considerable cost to both industry and the taxpayer. The estimated aggregate amount that has been expended on remediation efforts is in excess of \$200 million including more than \$50 million of taxpayer money. However, this recovery remains in a fragile state. It is completely contradictory to the efforts of both private and public bodies that a proposal for renewed mining activity in an environmentally sensitive estuary is being considered even while extensive environmental remediation efforts continue in other areas of the Sound at a significant cost. There is no attempt to quantify the costs associated with the inevitable environmental degradation that will result from this project or the potential adverse impact it will have on other remediation efforts being undertaken at both public and private expense.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3137	645 - 45	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>24. The proposed project is incompatible with the established recreational activity in the immediate vicinity of McNab Creek and in Howe Sound generally. There is an established recreational community immediately adjacent to the proposed site of the project as well as another established recreational community directly across Thornbrough Channel. This project will necessarily impair the use and enjoyment of these properties and will adversely affect their market value. Additionally, there are three youth's camps in the immediate vicinity as well as various other youth's camps in the Howe Sound area which use the McNab Creek estuary and surrounding waters for outdoor activities. Furthermore, the immediate vicinity of the proposed project is extensively used by kayakers, canoeists and other recreational boaters and there are established yacht club outstations directly across the Channel. The noise, dust and light pollution that would necessarily result from this project are clearly incompatible with these existing uses. There has been no attempt to quantify or value the adverse impact this project will have on these other stakeholders even though the social cost will be significant.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3138	645 - 46	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>25. The EIS concludes that there are no marine navigation impacts. However the increased barge traffic will run directly across a prime recreational boating area that during the summer months is used virtually on a daily basis by children from the neighbouring camps who travel in canoes and kayaks and cross Thornbrough Channel between McNab Creek and Ekins Point. Additionally, the proposed project is in the immediate vicinity of the newly designated marine trail that is designed to attract kayakers and other recreational users to the region. The proposed barge route transects the trail. The impact that this increased barge traffic could have cannot be readily quantified but could potentially endanger the safety of children and other recreational users of the maritime environment.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3139	645 - 47	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>26. Currently, local organization and local governments in the Howe Sound region are working to develop an overall land and marine use management plan for the region. In conjunction with these efforts, it has been recognized that it is important to understand the impact of cumulative effects. The Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations announced in 2015 that it would be proceeding with a cumulative effects framework for Howe Sound but the EIS does not refer to that announcement or take into account the work undertaken to date in connection with that planning initiative. In the absence of a proper understanding of the cumulative effects, it is impossible to properly assess the overall impact of the proposed project and the results of the preliminary work done should be taken into account in properly assessing the full impact of this project.</p>	<p>Page 4-33 of the EAC Application/EIS states: "MFLNRO is currently working on cumulative effects framework to help manage compounding changes to the environment. The cumulative effects framework is being actively applied in the Northeast, and MFLNRO plans to expand the framework to Howe Sound (MFLNRO 2015). Under this framework, Howe Sound will be considered as one region when impacts of major projects are assessed (Squamish Chief 2015). No announcement from MFLNRO has yet been made with respect to the cumulative effects framework implementation in Howe Sound."</p> <p>This remains the case. In the absence of a CEA Framework for Howe Sound, CEA Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCEAO Guideline for the Selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects (BCEAO 2013),</li> <li>- Operational Policy Statement: Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 2007),</li> <li>- Addressing Cumulative Environmental Effects. A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEA Agency 1994),</li> <li>- Cumulative Effects Practitioners Guide (CEA Agency 1999), and</li> <li>- A Reference Guide for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Determining Whether a project is Likely to Cause Significant Environmental Effects (FEARO 1994a).</li> </ul> <p>A detailed methods framework is provided in Volume 2, Part B – Section 4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in initiatives related to the monitoring, assessment, or management of cumulative environmental effects if requested by federal, provincial or regional government agencies.</p>
3140	645 - 48	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>27. Approval of this project would have a negative effect on the efforts of local governments promoting the recreational and eco-tourism benefits of the Sea to Sky Corridor and Howe Sound. Renewed industrial activity without comprehensive, long-term planning can only have a significant detrimental impact on surrounding communities and the world's perception of British Columbia as "Super Natural BC". Full consideration should be given to the potential negative impact that this project and renewed industrial activity will have on the tourism and recreation potential of the region and the costs associated with that need to be taken into account in any socio-economic analysis of the value of this project. That analysis is missing from the EIS.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3141	645 - 49	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	28. Similarly, due to its inherent natural beauty and proximity to Vancouver, there is extensive film production occurring in and around Howe Sound which has had a significant and ongoing positive economic impact for the region. A film location manager involved in a film which injected \$20 million into the local economy has stated that "the Burnco mine would be a strong deterrent for any film maker looking at working along the coastline". Noise, dust and visual impacts disrupt film activity and make the region less attractive to film production. Once again, the potential social cost to the region of this project thorough loss of film production activity could be significant but has been ignored in the EIS.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3142	645 - 50	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	29. There has been no assessment of the social cost of project's adverse impact on recreational opportunities and outdoor activities even though it is proposed as a prime recreational location. What will be the impact on the livability of the region and Vancouver's reputation as one of the most livable cities in the world if the last largely intact estuary in the region is turned into an open pit mine for the next 30 years?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3143	645 - 51	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	30. Dr. Murray Newman (the founding director of the Vancouver Aquarium) once said that "anywhere else in the world, Howe Sound would be a great national park". Although it has taken decades to come to fruition, those words may now be prophetic as there are ongoing initiatives to designate parts of Howe Sound as a National Park or a Marine Park. The core areas fundamental to such a designation include the marine areas adjacent to McNab Creek which are considered prime recreational areas that should be given full protection status. Such a designation will bring significant economic and environmental value to the area. To allow the proposed project to proceed would have a significant adverse impact on these efforts at a social cost that cannot be measured but should be taken into account in assessing this project.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3144	645 - 52	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	In summary, we believe that this project simply does not measure up to the goals of environmental, economic and social sustainability which underlie the assessment process. The EIS that has been submitted does not adequately take into account or address a number of critical factors and fails to properly assess potential adverse residual and cumulative effects to marine resources, recreational values and land management.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.  Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3145	645 - 53	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	<p>The shortcomings of this assessment highlight the concerns that significant environmental and socio-economic costs of this project will be borne by the residents, neighbouring communities and other economic stakeholders of Howe Sound while any benefit will accrue solely to the property owner.</p> <p>We strongly urge the Environmental Assessment Office to conclude that this project will have significant adverse environmental and socio-economic impact that cannot be justified and therefore should not be approved.</p> <p>Yours truly, The Future of Howe Sound Society</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3146	646 - 1	Future of Howe Sound Society	Howe Sound, BC	The attached letter from LGL Ltd., Environmental Research Associates, commissioned by Future of Howe Sound Society provides a review of the Burnco Aggregate project.	BURNCO prepared a Technical Memo response to comments provided by the Future of Howe Sound Society in a letter to Ruth Simons (Executive Director) from LGL Limited dated September 27, 2016 titled Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project. See 10-Jan-2017 Technical Memo entitled 'Response to Re: Review of the Environmental Assessment Certificate Application for the BURNCO Aggregate Project'.
3147	647 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	No to the gravel pit	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3148	648 - 1	Celia Roges	Chilliwack, BC	My whole family is appalled that you would consider gravel mining in McNab Inlet. Howe sound is just beginning to recover from the serious enviromental traumas it has received in the past and just when the porpoises and fish, and even a whale, are returning we hear you are about to destroy the recovery with an even more appalling one !	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3149	649 - 1	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	<p>This application fails to properly address how local amenities of silence and the wilderness experience, that local residential communities/ camps/yacht outstations, and huge Howe Sound visitors have high on their priority list, will be protected.</p> <p>As this area is so close to Vancouver it has become a huge recreational hub for the lower mainland and it is only going to continue to rise as people crave to leave the city for a quiet serene wilderness experience.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3150	649 - 2	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	<p>In this proposal there seems to be 12 job gains and I see no comparison to the job losses that might occur if this gravel mine is permitted to come into this highly sought out recreational area.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3151	649 - 3	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) is huge for humans who are attracted to this area for the silence and it is this silence that needs to be assessed as the driving force of future jobs in this area. Also the the impact of marine noise on underwater habitat, especially spawning salmon/young juvenile salmon and other at risk species is underestimated by the Science in this project proposal.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR D noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
3152	649 - 4	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) is huge for humans who are attracted to this area for the silence and it is this silence that needs to be assessed as the driving force of future jobs in this area. Also the the impact of marine noise on underwater habitat, especially spawning salmon/young juvenile salmon and other at risk species is underestimated by the Science in this project proposal.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3153	649 - 5	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	My understanding is that the project has been rejected twice by Fisheries & Oceans because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3154	649 - 6	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	Do we need more losses to a very fragile salmon returns?????	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3155	649 - 7	Jan Hagedorn	Gibsons, BC	It seems that population data for many key aquatic and land-bases species specific to this unique wilderness estuary (salmon, trout, elk to name a few) was collected over a very small timeline(part year?) to really be useful for establishing accurate baselines, and without accurate baselines quantitative monitoring of the effects of this proposed project will not be possible. At lease 5 years would provide info for agreed norms. This would allow the local governing bodies (eg. SCRD), the power to compel a reduction/suspension or cessation of mine activites where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms. Thank you for the space to comment.	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3156	650 - 1	Pete Willis	Bowen Island, BC	I do not support the Burnco Aggregate McNab Creek project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3157	650 - 2	Pete Willis	Bowen Island, BC	A lot of resources have gone into restoring the McNab Creek environment and placing a large industrial project on the estuary will nullify all of it. Howe Sound is just now recovering from its recent industrial past and mega projects with large eco footprints and a long future time line do not bode well for the newly expanding marine life in the sound. Please say no to the Burnco gravel mine.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3158	650 - 3	Pete Willis	Bowen Island, BC	A lot of resources have gone into restoring the McNab Creek environment and placing a large industrial project on the estuary will nullify all of it. Howe Sound is just now recovering from its recent industrial past and mega projects with large eco footprints and a long future time line do not bode well for the newly expanding marine life in the sound. Please say no to the Burnco gravel mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3159	651 - 1	Peter von Puttkamer	West Vancouver, BC	I grew up on the Howe Sound, beginning in the late 50's. Just as the Howe Sound has been cleaned up from years of environmental damage from the Woodfibre Pulp Mill, and Anaconda Mines- now this? This gravel operation will be a threat to McNab Creek estuary-Salmon Habitat! We don't need any industry on Howe Sound. This is an ecological and tourism wonder- that should be left as a showcase to the world: viewed by millions of people heading to Squamish, Whistler and the interior of the Province. Leave Howe Sound alone industry!	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3160	651 - 2	Peter von Puttkamer	West Vancouver, BC	I grew up on the Howe Sound, beginning in the late 50's. Just as the Howe Sound has been cleaned up from years of environmental damage from the Woodfibre Pulp Mill, and Anaconda Mines- now this? This gravel operation will be a threat to McNab Creek estuary-Salmon Habitat! We don't need any industry on Howe Sound. This is an ecological and tourism wonder- that should be left as a showcase to the world: viewed by millions of people heading to Squamish, Whistler and the interior of the Province. Leave Howe Sound alone industry!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3161	651 - 3	Peter von Puttkamer	West Vancouver, BC	I grew up on the Howe Sound, beginning in the late 50's. Just as the Howe Sound has been cleaned up from years of environmental damage from the Woodfibre Pulp Mill, and Anaconda Mines- now this? This gravel operation will be a threat to McNab Creek estuary-Salmon Habitat! We don't need any industry on Howe Sound. This is an ecological and tourism wonder- that should be left as a showcase to the world: viewed by millions of people heading to Squamish, Whistler and the interior of the Province. Leave Howe Sound alone industry!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3162	651 - 4	Peter von Puttkamer	West Vancouver, BC	I grew up on the Howe Sound, beginning in the late 50's. Just as the Howe Sound has been cleaned up from years of environmental damage from the Woodfibre Pulp Mill, and Anaconda Mines- now this? This gravel operation will be a threat to McNab Creek estuary-Salmon Habitat! We don't need any industry on Howe Sound. This is an ecological and tourism wonder- that should be left as a showcase to the world: viewed by millions of people heading to Squamish, Whistler and the interior of the Province. Leave Howe Sound alone industry!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3163	651 - 5	Peter von Puttkamer	West Vancouver, BC	I grew up on the Howe Sound, beginning in the late 50's. Just as the Howe Sound has been cleaned up from years of environmental damage from the Woodfibre Pulp Mill, and Anaconda Mines- now this? This gravel operation will be a threat to McNab Creek estuary-Salmon Habitat! We don't need any industry on Howe Sound. This is an ecological and tourism wonder- that should be left as a showcase to the world: viewed by millions of people heading to Squamish, Whistler and the interior of the Province. Leave Howe Sound alone industry!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3164	652 - 1	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	I am very concerned about the health of the estuary in the area proposed for the Brunco mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3165	652 - 2	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	It has taken decades for the herring and salmon and subsequent whales and olphins to recover in this area and to pollute and destroy it with this gravel mine would be a huge disservice to the wildlife, tourist and recreation in the area. This area is far more valuable as an estuary, recreational boating and tourist destination.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3166	652 - 3	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	It has taken decades for the herring and salmon and subsequent whales and olphins to recover in this area and to pollute and destroy it with this gravel mine would be a huge disservice to the wildlife, tourist and recreation in the area. This area is far more valuable as an estuary, recreational boating and tourist destination.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3167	652 - 4	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	It has taken decades for the herring and salmon and subsequent whales and olphins to recover in this area and to pollute and destroy it with this gravel mine would be a huge disservice to the wildlife, tourist and recreation in the area. This area is far more valuable as an estuary, recreational boating and tourist destination.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3168	652 - 5	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	Please see the bigger picture that detroying it with noisy, filthy gravel mining would result in loss of value for all species who live in the area and would cost far more than the income derived from a gravel pit by the loss of tourist revenue, fishing incomes and potential property values that would plummet in this currently recovered breathtaking area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCRD noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3169	652 - 6	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	<p>Please see the bigger picture that detroying it with noisy, filthy gravel mining would result in loss of value for all species who live in the area and would cost far more than the income derived from a gravel pit by the loss of tourist revenue, fishing incomes and potential property values that would plummet in this currently recovered breathtaking area.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3170	652 - 7	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	<p>Please see the bigger picture that detroying it with noisy, filthy gravel mining would result in loss of value for all species who live in the area and would cost far more than the income derived from a gravel pit by the loss of tourist revenue, fishing incomes and potential property values that would plummet in this currently recovered breathtaking area.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3171	652 - 8	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	This area is much better suited to a world class marine park with its close proximity to Vancouver while offering unequalled marine habitat beauty and diversity	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3172	652 - 9	Deborah Geoffrion	Gibsons, BC	This area is much better suited to a world class marine park with its close proximity to Vancouver while offering unequalled marine habitat beauty and diversity	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
3173	653 - 1	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	As a life long North Shore resident and avid swimmer of Howe Sound I am opposed to the Burnco Mine Project proposal.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3174	653 - 2	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	There are too many potential environmental risks associated with the project.	Potential effects of the Proposed Project have been assessed for selected valued environmental components to address key issues related to fish and fish habitat, marine resources, terrestrial wildlife and vegetation, geotechnical and natural hazards, water resources, air quality and climate change.  The assessment concludes that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the Proposed Project.  A detailed assessment of potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B of the EAC Application/EIS.
3175	653 - 3	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	Just recently we have seen an improvement in water quality in Howe Sound after many years of cleanup from the Britannia mine. There is enough industry impacting the waters of Howe Sound.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3176	653 - 4	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	The salmon and other species that call the Howe Sound home need to be preserved and protected.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3177	653 - 5	Krista Page-Cowan	North Vancouver, BC	The environment needs to be a priority over profit.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3178	654 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Tatlayoko Lake, BC	I am a property owner in BC. I lived several years in the Vancouver, Howe Sound area, and it is an incredibly beautiful place. I believe very strongly that you should be applying great care to preserve and protect this diverse and important area of the natural world. It is the playground of Vancouver, and as such it should be protected and shared. Please consider carefully your decisions to allow a aggregate mine in this area. It will be remembered for many years in the future	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3179	655 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	Howe Sound will be left with a hole filled with water that cannot grow trees, and estuary values for the future is reduced to near zero. The proponent takes away \$200 million of gravel and may leave 1/10 behind in economic value. There are other BC gravel deposits where the harm would be far less than removing the estuary. The proponent made a bad investment and the Howe Sound should not have to pay for a poor business decision. No one can predict how the loss of the estuary will factor into the future of howe sound in 20-100 years. There is no alternative to the habitat of the McNab estuary. Burnco cannot build another replacement estuary for any price.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3180	656 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>With the multiple projects planned for our region, it has been challenging to adequately review these projects sufficiently. That is an issue that needs to be addressed. If such a large number of significant projects are going to be proposed with such tight timeframes, it may be important to consider capacity funding to support adequate community evaluation of projects.</p> <p>Although I spent a lot of time reviewing the WoodfibreLNG proposal, it only came to light that they had significantly misrepresented their GHG emissions when I was reviewing the subsequent Mt. Mulligan proposal from FortisBC. (WoodfibreLNG used an unrealistically low GHG factor for their electricity consumption). When I tried to raise this with the CEAA during their GHG review of WoodfibreLNG, they said they weren't going to review something the BC EAO had signed off on, regardless if I was correct. If the BC EAO isn't going to catch such issues, and the CEAA won't review the BC EAO work then it's important to fund citizens to conduct a sufficient evaluation of these projects.</p> <p>The above is the reason why my own comments regarding the Burnco project are much shorter. I did take the time to thoroughly review the attached "Burnco - Issues - Chris Pettingill.pdf" document. Although I did not personally draft the document, I strongly agree with the concerns raised.</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3181	656 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	In addition to the issues raised in the attachment, I have serious concerns around deficiencies in cumulative impact analysis included in the Burnco application:	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3182	656 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	- The application seems to think that in terms of socio-economic impacts, it is too far from Woodfibre to have any interaction. However, both facilities are in the Sea-to-Sky “Corridor”, and are all part of “Howe Sound”. The many tourists travelling to Whistler experience the sound as a contiguous area that has a positive transition from over-industrialization back to natural beauty. Many new business and residents have arrived precisely because of this natural beauty.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3183	- 1			A return of multiple significant industrial projects on Howe Sound should be evaluated for cumulative socio-economic impacts, especially on tourism, and the region's natural brand. An assessment that fails to recognize that all development on the whole Sound impacts the whole sound is seriously flawed. The assessment also makes absolutely no mention of the new compressor station planned for Mt. Mulligan which is again further re-industrialization of the area. Any significant shift in economic basis will have impacts, but these have not been addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement. A thorough Socio-Economic impact study that considers all proposed projects in the sound should be completed and made available for public comment before the project is considered for approval.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3184	656 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	- The application does not seem to address the approved Woodfibre LNG cooling system. Cetaceans and fish alike travel the whole Sound. Although these facilities may have distance between them, they represent a growing collection of stresses on fish and other wildlife that travel the whole sound. The cumulative stress needs to be addressed. We're not dealing with goldfish that stay confined to a little bowl. The project should not be considered for approval without a more comprehensive assessment on the cumulative impacts on fish and wildlife has been completed and made available for public comment.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3185	656 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	- The geography of the Sound makes it a funnel for pollution, and even today we see a concentration of pollution from the lower mainland funnel up through Squamish on some summer days. The cumulative impacts assessment fails to take the impacts on Squamish from the Burnco operations, and it fails to address the additional impacts from the proposed Mt. Mulligan compressor. An air quality assessment needs to consider how pollutants travel in the sound, and the cumulative impacts of all major projects. Mt. Garibaldi has also been excluded, and yet it represents a significant addition to regional traffic (pollution) and thus Howe Sound pollution. Once again, public comment on an adequate cumulative assessment of air impacts that actually considers all relevant projects in the Sound should be a necessary part of any consideration of approval.	A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3186	656 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I'd further like to add that the Woodfibre LNG impact statement did not include cumulative assessments that considered the Mt. Mulligan project, or the related hydro substation. The proposed Mt. Mulligan impact statement did not include a cumulative assessment that considered Woodfibre LNG or the related hydro substation to any significant degree in terms of pollution. Mt. Garibaldi also neglected to include some/all of these projects in its cumulative assessment. Now we have yet another major industrial project proposed, and still has been no comprehensive cumulative assessment of socio-economic or environmental impacts that includes all of these projects. Enough is enough. Before ANY significant project is allowed to proceed the public needs someone to provide a comprehensive cumulative assessment that considers all of these projects. Doing so is supposed to be a requirement of the EA process, and yet so far, everyone has managed to avoid doing the necessary work.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3187	656 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated  The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.  Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08___Full_Report___Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08___Full_Report___Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a>	The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.  Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by: - Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC; - Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and - Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.  The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3188	656 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3189	656 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., five years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3190	656 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3191	656 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3192	656 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCRD said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3193	656 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m2 of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m2 of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
3194	656 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3195	656 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
3196	656 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3197	656 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
3198	656 - 15	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3199	656 - 16	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3200	656 - 17	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3201	656 - 18	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3202	656 - 19	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3203	656 - 20	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
3204	656 - 21	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
3205	656 - 22	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR D noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3206	656 - 23	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
3207	656 - 24	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
3208	656 - 25	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3209	656 - 26	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
3210	656 - 27	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide the assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3211	656 - 28	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
3212	656 - 29	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3213	656 - 30	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
3214	656 - 31	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3215	656 - 32	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3216	657 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>This mine would be destroying lots of land and fish habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3217	657 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>This mine would be destroying lots of land and fish habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3218	657 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	The waters of the howe sound are finally coming back strong with life.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3219	657 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	This project absolutely can not go through. S.O.S	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3220	658 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	I am opposed to the BURNCO Rock Products Ltd. proposal to construct a large-scale, open-pit, sand and gravel mine in McNab Creek in Howe Sound.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3221	658 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Burnaby, BC	I am for the preservation of McNab Creek and all of Howe Sound.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3222	659 - 1	Chris Dietrich	North Vancouver, BC	<p>I just wanted to voice my concern about the gravel mine that Burnco has proposed to put in beautiful Howe Sound. Howe Sound has inspired me in so many ways. It has been my childhood escape where I could just be a kid, playing with my friends in the forest or enjoying paddle boarding, kayaking and fishing of the dock in the early morning.</p> <p>I was so inspired in fact, that I made many movies there, capturing the glorious scenery. Little did I know that there were other people interested in the Howe Sound, and it was not people who necessarily aiming to make things better for the community in the area. When I heard about the mine, I was appalled and scared about the future of the community, the peacefulness, the spectacular scenery, and of course the wildlife.</p> <p>I decided to get my camera out once again and create a short 5 minute video, giving awareness about the multitude of recreational activities and the nature within this region along with the increasingly-real threat that looms over it. I also knew that there were mines there before. Britannia Mine being one of the biggest polluters in Canada, harmed the Howe Sound immensely. Only recently have the prawns, crab, salmon, orcas and dolphins come back. We do not want to make that same environmental mistake twice in such a fragile ecosystem...and that was the drive for my video. Next summer I'm planning a more professional documentary on the history, threats and sustainability of Howe Sound.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3223	660 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Maple Ridge, BC	No information or a vote to the Squamish nation membership on or off reserve. Getting the signatures of a few elected does not equate consensus.	<p>Potential effects on Aboriginal Interest, including current use, are presented in Part C of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal interests were assessed for the following Aboriginal Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Squamish Nation</li> <li>- Tsleil-Waututh Nation</li> <li>- Musqueam Indian Band</li> <li>- Stz'uminus First Nation</li> <li>- Cowichan Tribes</li> <li>- Lyackson First Nation</li> <li>- Penelakut Tribe</li> <li>- Metis Nation British Columbia</li> </ul> <p>Potential effects on Aboriginal rights, including current use of lands and resources, were identified for the Squamish Nation and the Tsleil-Waututh Nation. Mitigation proposed is designed to address these potential effects.</p> <p>Both of these groups are participating in the EA review as members of the Technical Working Group.</p> <p>BURNCO is engaged in ongoing discussions on the Proposed Project with the Squamish Nation and the Tselil-Waututh Nation about commitments and processes for addressing their specific concerns, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access management for marine and terrestrial harvesting activities</li> <li>- marine use planning</li> <li>- ongoing involvement in environmental management and monitoring activities, and</li> <li>- ensuring the long-term ecological function of McNab Creek.</li> </ul>
3224	661 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	I am against the Burnco gravel pit mine as over the last few years we have seen an amazing increase in the amazing wildlife in this area, whales, porpoise and more. A clear indication that we are moving in the right direction to ensure marine biology has the environment that they need to thrive.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3225	661 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife with the introduction of this project, i believe will have substantial and irreparable environmental damage to the creek and its fish and foreshore habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3226	661 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	The environmental impact on land, bird and marine wildlife with the introduction of this project, i believe will have substantial and irreparable environmental damage to the creek and its fish and foreshore habitat.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3227	661 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	There will be increased barge traffic in the sound and significant noise pollution which won't only impact boaters and residents, but also marine life. I trust that you will listen to the pleas of those that live and frequent this area, and the effects on the environment if this project should move forward. We only have one earth, we must treat it with respect.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
3228	662 - 1	Joan McCullough	Lions Bay, BC	Here we go again for the third time. When will Burnco and the Eao finally stop contemplating that this project would even be a possibility in Howe Sound. You have seen and heard all the comments from very qualified environmentalists and residents here. Over 99% according to our math are against this disgusting project FOR THE 3RD TIME. When are you going to realise that the Residents and Friends of Howe Sound will not allow this project to go ahead.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3229	662 - 2	Joan McCullough	Lions Bay, BC	There is no shortage of gravel and according to our local gravel suppliers in Squamish and North Vancouver there is no reason to destroy our environment and flood the market.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3230	662 - 3	Joan McCullough	Lions Bay, BC	If Alberta wants more gravel, they can dig up in Alberta, not here in Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge fro Treat Creek (eas of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>
3231	662 - 4	Joan McCullough	Lions Bay, BC	99% of respondents have voiced their opinion AGAINST this project,YES 99% Therefore you have no social licence to say yes to this project. All local press comments are against this project. I cannot imagine what the fall-out will be if you say yes. No matter what you decide, our local citizens will make sure it will not go ahead. This affront on our fishing and wild life habitat will not be allowed.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3232	663 - 1	Kelly Smith	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The proposed gravel mine at McNab Creek, along with the recently approved LNG project at Woodfibre, and with other proposed, current, and past developments in Howe Sound have had, and will continue to have a number of significant direct and cumulative environmental effects to Howe Sound.</p> <p>As a resident living at the mouth of Howe Sound, I have seen Howe Sound slowly recover from the environmental impacts of past industrialization. For example, a few weeks ago my six year old grandson and I saw four Orca's close to Hutt Island. There also have been several sightings of humpback whales in our areas. Some fisheries are also making a comeback. This is a sign of slow recovery, since such events were a very uncommon in the past century that marked the height of environmental destruction in Howe Sound.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3233	663 - 2	Kelly Smith	Bowen Island, BC	<p>The proposed gravel mine represents a significant threat to the recovery of Howe Sound. Furthermore, in recent years there has been significant loss in the science-based capabilities of provincial and federal environmental agencies, that threatens the credibility of environmental reviews.</p> <p>Accordingly, the project must not be considered, approved or constructed until:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Howe Sound's environmental recovery is complete and the project is reassessed at that time, and</li> <li>2) Decision-making agencies clearly demonstrate that their decisions are based on the recommendations of qualified professional scientists and engineers with specialized environmental knowledge.</li> </ol>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3234	664 - 1	Bill Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>To have machinery digging in the riparian area of McNab Creek and valley is definitely wrong, as these areas are extremely sensitive to disturbances. Even modest changes in the amount and timing of water flow may result in significant changes to the physical and biological functioning of these ecosystems.</p>	<p>No disturbance of McNab Creek riparian areas is proposed. Riparian buffers will be retained along watercourses with the exception of the upper segment of the existing constructed groundwater-fed channel WC2 which will be removed as part of the Proposed Project. The banks within this segment are steep and long with slopes as high as 45 degrees and a bank slope approximately 10 m long throughout much of the watercourse. The slopes are exposed and have little riparian vegetation, resulting in erosion and deposition of fines and sand on the channel bed. The lack of riparian vegetation limits shade and overhanging vegetation cover for fish in this segment. The removal of this segment will be offset by the construction of a 790 m long channel extension which will provide 5,341 m<sup>2</sup> of new fish habitat and a net gain of more than 22,000 m<sup>2</sup> of riparian habitat.</p>
3235	664 - 2	Bill Anderson	Gibsons, BC	<p>Work in the area would interfere with natural flood cycles that are critical to healthy riparian zones. Floods bring essential supplies of water, nutrients and sediment. They also help to create backwater that serve as critical fish nurseries.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 (Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3236	664 - 3	Bill Anderson	Gibsons, BC	The McNab Creek riparian area and estuary is critical to a healthy marine environment. Please do not allow any industrialization of this sensitive area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3237	664 - 4	Bill Anderson	Gibsons, BC	The McNab Creek riparian area and estuary is critical to a healthy marine environment. Please do not allow any industrialization of this sensitive area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3238	665 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to say I am against the Bunco Aggregate Project at McNab Creek. As a retired marine biologist, this is an extremely damaging proposal to the estuary environment. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans have turned this project down for serious consequences to fish and fish habitat. The estuary is a vital and essential habitat for the transition of species between the marine and fresh water ecosystem. This places need to be protected.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3239	665 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to say I am against the Bunco Aggregate Project at McNab Creek. As a retired marine biologist, this is an extremely damaging proposal to the estuary environment. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans have turned this project down for serious consequences to fish and fish habitat. The estuary is a vital and essential habitat for the transition of species between the marine and fresh water ecosystem. This places need to be protected.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3240	665 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	I am writing to say I am against the Bunco Aggregate Project at McNab Creek. As a retired marine biologist, this is an extremely damaging proposal to the estuary environment. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans have turned this project down for serious consequences to fish and fish habitat. The estuary is a vital and essential habitat for the transition of species between the marine and fresh water ecosystem. This places need to be protected.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3241	666 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	This project carries too much risk for McNab Creek and Howe Sound and will negatively impact the resurgence of marine life, ecotourism and recreation which are all part of the sustainable use of the area. Please do not approve this plan.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3242	667 - 1	Steve Richardson	Gambier Island, BC	60 odd yrs on Gambier have watched the rape & foul pollution of Howe sound & its watersheds.the discharge from Port Mellon pulp mill fouled the water so much visibility was limited to a few inches.How,in this day and age can we allow any more of this carnage,the mere fact that it has to be debated is a disgrace to anyone who remotely cares about the natural world that's being killed around us. Please prove that greed and money doesn't always win!	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
3243	668 - 1	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	I do not believe that the proposed Burnco Aggregate Project constitutes an appropriate development for the McNab Creek Site.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3244	668 - 2	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	First, the project would compromise the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. These environments are some of the richest parts of the shoreline in terms of sheer density of life. As someone who experiences a great deal of hope and comfort in connection with recent signs of ecological recovery in Howe Sound, I would be devastated to see such a critical marine habitat disturbed by the mine.	A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.  The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3245	668 - 3	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	<p>First, the project would compromise the second largest estuary in Howe Sound. These environments are some of the richest parts of the shoreline in terms of sheer density of life. As someone who experiences a great deal of hope and comfort in connection with recent signs of ecological recovery in Howe Sound, I would be devastated to see such a critical marine habitat disturbed by the mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3246	668 - 4	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	<p>Vibrations will interfere with the reproduction, food finding and navigational activities of marine life such as orcas and dolphins, who have just begin returning to this area.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3247	668 - 5	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	Secondly, the mine would essentially block the movement of wildlife between the upper parts of the valley and the estuary, eliminating this important corridor between the estuary and the uplands. I am very concerned about this displacement of wildlife. Burnco's own consultants identified 23 species at risk that would be threatened by the mine.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3248	668 - 6	Janine MacLeod	Vancouver, BC	Finally, I am concerned about the cumulative impacts of the proposed aggregate project, run of river projects in the area, and logging. How many stresses from human extractive activity should that valley be expected to handle?	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3249	669 - 1	Trish Thompson	Port Mellon, BC	Estuaries are set up to save the natural habitat of areas and now you want to let folks make a gravel pit in an estuary, this is just pure craziness and borderline insanity, please do not allow a gravel pit in our McNab Creek Estuary.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3250	670 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>To save you the effort of reading lots of prose:</p> <p>Howe Sound is finally recovering after decades of industry and the contamination left behind by these industries. Herring and Whales are returning in record numbers. We must put long term protection of Howe Sound at the top of priorities in the region.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3251	670 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	It will have significantly more economic benefits through fisheries and tourism.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3252	670 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	If industry were made to pay the true costs of their pollution and also cleanup their mess after their operations come to an end, then they likely wouldn't be economically viable.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>
3253	670 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Gravel is not is short supply - there is no need for a new mine to satisfy needs.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3254	670 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	This project has already been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans because of the likely loss of salmon habitat - I don't understand the system - it seems that companies just keep resubmitting until they finally get approval. Rejections are for valid reasons and they shouldn't be easily overturned by successive tweaks.	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3255	670 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	This project has already been rejected by Fisheries & Oceans because of the likely loss of salmon habitat - I don't understand the system - it seems that companies just keep resubmitting until they finally get approval. Rejections are for valid reasons and they shouldn't be easily overturned by successive tweaks.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3256	670 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Increased marine traffic - it seems that the environmental approval process doesn't consider the combined impacts of all proposed projects - if you add the barges from this project to the LNG tankers for the proposed Woodfibre LNG project, we are adding a lot of traffic.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
3257	670 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Noise from these will affect whales and generally diminish the natural environment.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3258	670 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	We have the wonderful new Sea to Sky Marine Trail which is bringing more kayakers to the area.	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>
3259	670 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	These large vessels will decrease the experience for these tourists.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3260	670 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	I know that people will be arguing the lack of jobs for this project and I agree, but to honest I don't understand why this should even be a consideration for an environmental assessment - it's a bad project for the environment - it shouldn't matter with there are significant jobs or not.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3261	670 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Noise, air quality, dust in the vicinity of a residential area - this isn't fair to the local residents.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3262	670 - 13	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Noise, air quality, dust in the vicinity of a residential area - this isn't fair to the local residents.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3263	670 - 14	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	Howe Sound is such a magical area that has so much aesthetic value along with the value of its ecosystem services. Can you imagine if other iconic locations around the world such as Yosemite Valley, Milford Sound, the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, etc etc were not protected and allowed industries? I don't think people realize that Howe Sound really is just as special as all of these places and should be protected!	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3264	671 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	<p>The following from Golder Associates to Burnco Aggregate Project. Why was this report relying on old information from 2005 and beyond? The geological hazards in the McNab area are significant as this report shows. An "assessment comprising a desktop review of existing information" is not acceptable, especially knowing the fact that this project is in the Cascadia Subduction earthquake zone. (5.4.4 Baseline Conditions) "The natural hazards baseline conditions was completed by conducting a terrain and terrain stability mapping assessment comprising a desktop review of existing information, production of a terrain base map, and analysis of the potential for the terrain hazards to affect the Proposed Project facilities". (5.4.4.5 Discussion) "avalanching and steep valley sidewall debris and rock slides are common in the McNab Creek watershed, they are not expected to directly affect the LSA. Activities associated with the Proposed Project Area are not anticipated to increase the potential for initiating mass wasting (i.e., landslide) events. How was this determined?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p>
3265	671 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Gibsons, BC	<p>Landslides and snow avalanches can transport debris and sediment to creeks, increase water volumes, increase fine sediment transport, and in some cases debris jams can cause outburst floods (as seen with debris flood events). Evidence for significant debris flows and debris floods (including outburst floods) was not identified in this desktop assessment".</p> <p>Current geological data would be critical for making sound sensible decisions on outcomes for this area.</p> <p>At the end of production, a huge water filled pit remains, with man made silt berms to the North and one to the South, just one good avalanche, or an extreme winter rainstorm could push through the berm and take out the whole pit. This would ruin the McNab estuary for many years. Could we experience another Mount Polley? or a failed Bafokeng Dam? "The report, which was released on Friday morning in Victoria, said the design failed to take into account the complexity of the instability of underlying glacial and pre-glacial layers under the retaining wall". This is a project that could become a huge environmental disaster, something we do not need!</p>	<p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p> <p>Based on a conservative assessment using the existing geotechnical data from subsurface investigations previously carried out, the risk of significant and extensive liquefaction in the Project area is considered to be low to very low, and likely only to be associated with a large earthquake (i.e. 1 in 2,475 year event). Therefore, supplementary geotechnical investigations and analyses are not considered to be required.</p> <p>The Flood Protection Dyke and Pit Lake Containment Berm will be designed and built to appropriate design criteria, which include seismic stability considerations.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3266	672 - 1	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	I am writing in opposition to the Burnco Mine Project on the basis that it will cause harm to McNab Creek and the McNab Creek estuary which cannot be mitigated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3267	672 - 2	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	I am writing in opposition to the Burnco Mine Project on the basis that it will cause harm to McNab Creek and the McNab Creek estuary which cannot be mitigated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3268	672 - 3	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	<p>There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3269	672 - 4	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	<p>There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3270	672 - 5	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	<p>There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3271	673 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>A) Estuaries Not a Location for Large Industrial Plants</p> <p>As a (past) member of the Squamish Estuary Management Committee (SEMC), representing Environment Canada, we recognized the significant ecological importance of estuarine ecosystems. The Committee's work led to a series of management plans and the current Wildlife Management Area (WMA) to help address the very significant past impacts of chemical contamination and habitat destruction in the Squamish Estuary. I often wondered, "if only early decision-makers had known about the ecological importance of estuaries, and that estuaries are not the location to build a large industrial plants."</p> <p>Now, in 2016, decision-makers are faced with the same question, whether to build a large industrial plant in Howe Sound's second largest estuary, after the Squamish. However, in 2016 decision-makers know, or ought to know that natural estuaries provide many irreplaceable ecological services and are unsuitable for large industrial plants like the proposed project at McNab Creek.</p> <p>Environmental assessment professionals recognize that at its core, environmental reviews are an assessment of alternatives. In this case the proponent and agencies need to better consider alternative locations, since an estuary like McNab Creek is not the right location.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3272	673 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>A) Estuaries Not a Location for Large Industrial Plants</p> <p>As a (past) member of the Squamish Estuary Management Committee (SEMC), representing Environment Canada, we recognized the significant ecological importance of estuarine ecosystems. The Committee's work led to a series of management plans and the current Wildlife Management Area (WMA) to help address the very significant past impacts of chemical contamination and habitat destruction in the Squamish Estuary. I often wondered, "if only early decision-makers had known about the ecological importance of estuaries, and that estuaries are not the location to build a large industrial plants."</p> <p>Now, in 2016, decision-makers are faced with the same question, whether to build a large industrial plant in Howe Sound's second largest estuary, after the Squamish. However, in 2016 decision-makers know, or ought to know that natural estuaries provide many irreplaceable ecological services and are unsuitable for large industrial plants like the proposed project at McNab Creek.</p> <p>Environmental assessment professionals recognize that at its core, environmental reviews are an assessment of alternatives. In this case the proponent and agencies need to better consider alternative locations, since an estuary like McNab Creek is not the right location.</p>	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3273	673 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Bowen Island, BC	<p>B) Professional Science and Engineering Signoff</p> <p>The EAO and CEAA websites seldom provide review details or the analysis undertaken by individual government scientists and engineers. Usually, websites provide larger, carefully written reports that do not attribute analysis.</p> <p>Furthermore, formal agencies' correspondence or reports, provide little or no information on the professional qualifications of those government scientists and engineers taking professional responsibility for the science and engineering elements in the review. In its early days, the EAO was much more transparent and published almost all internal government analysis on reviews.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is now difficult for the public to determine whether the review analysis was undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, or by others. The public credibility of EA reviews has suffered tremendously, with the perception and sometimes of the reality of government making decisions in the absence of sound science advice.</p> <p>Therefore, government reviewing agencies need to explicitly list the professional qualifications and affiliations of their reviewers and the topics they reviewed. This is particularly important for engineering or geosciences issues where the "BC Engineers and Geoscientists Act", requires that work that falls within the Act be undertaken or directly supervised by a suitably professional engineer or</p>	<p>BURNCO engaged an independent and reputable team of qualified scientists and EA practitioners from Golder Associates Ltd. to conduct the required studies and prepare and environmental assessment for the Proposed Project. Golder is a global, employee-owned company with over 50 years of experience. They have over 400 BC-based staff involved in environmental assessment and related activities. All of Golder's work undergoes a high level of quality control and technical review. In addition, some of Golder's work for this project – specifically the groundwater modelling of the proposed mine plan – was subject to third-party technical review prior to being relied upon for the assessment.</p> <p>The qualifications and experience of the EA Project Team is presented in Section 2.1.1. of the EAC Application/EIS. Their work will be subject to further technical review through the ongoing EA review process.</p> <p>Many of the studies undertaken and changes made to the Proposed Project were a direct result of our consultants findings and recommendations.</p> <p>BURNCO is a 104-year old company that has built a reputation as a responsible resource developer. We depend upon independent assessments such as those conducted for the EA to help ensure we protect our reputation and don't put our business at risk.</p>
3274	674 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>RE: Key concerns regarding BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project, proposed at McNab Creek in Howe Sound. While I have had very limited time to adequately review this proposal within the short timeframe permitted by the BC EAO/CEAA, I have outlined a few of my key concerns follows:</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3275	674 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>1) Estuaries are an irreplaceable natural resource.</p> <p>Estuaries deliver invaluable ecosystem services, as well as providing economic, cultural, and ecological benefits to communities.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands are one of the ecosystems most threatened by development, however they trap (sequester) more carbon than rainforests. Both seagrasses and salt marsh grasses are incredibly productive carbon sinks, as the carbon they use to make their leaves are incorporated into the layers of sediment every year. Estuaries worldwide sequester up to 100 teragrams of carbon per year. Saltmarshes sequester up to 24 tonnes of carbon per hectare per year.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands also help to make our water cleaner, as they act like a giant liver that filters and traps pollutants such as herbicides, pesticides, and heavy metals, as well as sediments and nutrients. They are hotspots for biodiversity, and are vital as habitat for migrating birds, and nurseries for juvenile fish. They stabilize shorelines, minimize erosion, and protect coastal areas from floods and storm surges, acting like a sponge and soaking up the excess floodwater.</p> <p>Vegetated coastal habitats such as seagrasses and saltmarsh habitat rank amongst the most threatened marine ecosystems. About 25% of the area originally covered by salt-marshes has been globally lost due to development, with current loss rates at about 1 to 2% per</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3276	674 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>McNab Creek is the second-largest estuary in Howe Sound, one of only three estuaries located in this southern-most fjord. It deserves to be protected.</p> <p>QUESTIONS: Given the proximity of alternative, undeveloped gravel resources, why should this gravel mine be permitted in such a vitally important and sensitive ecosystem? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of the invaluable ecosystem services outlined above? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of the McNab Creek estuary as a carbon sink?</p> <p>SOURCES:</p> <p>Bridgham, S.D., J.P. Magonigal, J.K. Keller, N.B. Bliss, and C. Trettin. 2006. The carbon balance of North American wetlands. <i>Wetlands</i> 26: 889–916.</p> <p>Cebrian, J. and C. M. Duarte. 1996. Plant growth-rate dependence of detrital carbon storage in ecosystems. <i>Science</i> 268: 1606-1608.</p> <p>Duarte, C.M., W.C. Dennison, R.J.W. Orth and T.J.B. Carruthers. 2008. The charisma of coastal ecosystems: addressing the imbalance”- <i>Estuaries and Coasts</i> 31:233–238.</p> <p>Duarte, C.M., M. Holmer, Y. Olsen, D. Soto, N. Marbà, J. Guiu, K. Black and I. Karakassis. 2009. Will the Oceans Help Feed Humanity?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3277	674 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>2) Loss of channel complexity and sediment replenishment</p> <p>The proponent proposes to build a dike along the northern and eastern edge of the gravel extraction area which will permanently restrict the flow of McNab Creek. While it appears that the current channel hasn't changed in quite some time, the restriction of creeks/rivers limits channel complexity by restricting the powerful currents that would typically shape the watercourse and surrounding floodplain. These changes to how creeks/rivers flow results in the loss of the complex network of side channels, sloughs, alcoves, ponds, and wetlands, as well as a loss of floodplain forest. These diverse and dynamic habitats are very important for salmon, beavers, river otters, and birds, and other fauna.</p> <p>These dikes will isolate McNab Creek from its natural fan delta, restricting sediment replenishment in the western part of the estuary. This in turn will likely increase the risk of erosion of the shoreline and tidal flat, resulting in loss of diverse habitats.</p> <p>Water flowing beneath creeks/rivers periodically resurfaces to create coldwater refuges for temperature-sensitive fish like salmon and trout. These coldwater refuges are vital, especially given the current and future impacts of climate change on these iconic west-coast species.</p> <p>Question 3.1: What mitigation is proposed to offset the loss of natural river-mouth migration, and the loss of sediment deposition</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>
3278	674 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Squamish, BC	<p>QUESTIONS: How will the proponent offset the loss of sediment deposition on the western part of the estuary? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of channel complexity and diverse habitats vital to salmon and other species as outlined above?</p> <p>SOURCES:</p> <p>Hulse, D. &amp; Gregory, S. (2004) Integrating resilience into floodplain restoration. Urban Ecosystems 7: 295.</p>	<p>The biological function of the estuary is influenced by the sediment supply currently entering the estuary from McNab Creek which is derived from actively eroding locations within the watershed. The extraction of terrestrial gravel deposits from the pit is not expected to impact or change the function of the estuary because the alluvial fan is not a contributor to the sediment/gravel budget.</p> <p>Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will include consistent monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Project caused effects</p>
3279	675 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	See attached	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3280	675 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	RE: Burnco's Application for an Environmental Assessment permit This letter is being submitted as a result of your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products regarding its proposal for an open pit mine at McNabb Creek.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3281	675 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Its apparent that there is a lot of people "going through the motions" to attempt to justify the re-introduction of industry to the Howe Sound area. Each project proposed, a strip mine here, an LNG terminal there, the potential for a logging operation somewhere else, a garbage incinerator, a power generation plant, enough. The cumulative effects are going to be overwhelming, its plan to see that if we let one project grow others will follow, so say NO to this project, tell the rest of the region that we still possess a government that works for the people.	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3282	675 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>This project in particular is troubling. Though every environmental and geologic consultant will affirm that they can “mitigate” (aka destroy now and attempt to fix later the damage done, we have never see this. Once Burnco remove the volume of 10 x BC place stadiums from the estuary there is no recovery possible. Any reasonable human being can predict the outcome. Like Britannia Mine before the rock sediment will eventually leach into the ocean. Like Britannia the acidic nature of this rock will destroy the at least part of the food chain. That was work restored by tax dollars.</p>	<p>Information regarding geochemical testing for ML-ARD potential is presented in Section 5.5.5.2.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The results of geochemical testing are presenting in Appendix 5.6-C.</p> <p>Yes, geochemical testing was conducted on 3 composite samples collected from two test pits at the Project site. The geochemical testing program included acid base accounting, whole rock and trace metal analysis, and sequential leach tests. The objective of acid base accounting was to determine the material’s potential to generate acidity. The acid base accounting results confirmed that the materials contained no sulphide minerals; oxidation of sulphide minerals is the primary source of long-term acid generation potential. Therefore, the materials are considered to have a low potential for long-term acid generation.</p> <p>The results of whole rock and trace metal analysis were used to identify parameters that may require further consideration in the context of metal leaching potential. Sequential leach testing was used to evaluate the metal leaching potential of the materials. Sequential leach testing is appropriate for evaluating the potential for metal leaching in the absence of reactive sulphide minerals, therefore this test method was used in place of the humidity cell test method (HCT). The results of the sequential leach tests were screened in the context of the BCWQ and CCME Guidelines for the protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life to identify parameters of potential environmental concern. The results of the sequential leach tests were used to develop inputs to the water quality predictions for the Proposed Project.</p>
3283	675 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>McNab creek itself will inevitably change course, flow to the lowest possible ground, the pit and stop flowing its current course. The spot prawn breeding ground will affect the fishery. It doesn’t take a string of degrees to see this has happened in this place before, and its take 100 years of effort to bring it all back.</p>	<p>The primary purpose of the McNab Creek Flood Control Dyke considered when illustrating the extent of the structure in the EAC Application/EIS was the management of floods from McNab Creek. The primary purpose of the Pit Lake Containment Berm considered when illustrating the extent of this structure was the containment of floods from within the Pit Lake. The Site topography and the design flood stage of the Pit Lake did not necessitate the extension of the berm to intersect with the McNab Creek Flood Control Dyke. Both the McNab Creek Flood Control Dyke and the Pit Lake Containment Berm are being engineered to serve the function of a training berm as discussed in the avulsion risk assessment provided in Appendix 5.4-A of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3284	675 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>These are just a couple concerns, there are more. All of these concerns can be "mitigated", that is destroyed forever with the hope of recovery later.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
3285	675 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>Its likely that the thin wall of land and trees between the ocean and proposed pit (a pit that will grow large enough by Burnco's own volume measurements to engulf 10 BC place stadiums) will be eroded by the seasonal winter storms until there is no more wall of land and trees, just a bay. First hand I've see a dock capable of 20 foot tide swings ripped from its moorings in a winter storm in that exact location. The dock was lost. What would 24 hours of 5 foot tall wave do. You don't need a degree to understand the likely outcome. Burnco plans to operate the mine for at least 20 years. That's 7,300 chances for that one storm from which there can be no mitigation.</p>	<p>The pit lake is located more than 400 metres in land and is not at risk of being inundated by marine waves. The primary purpose of the Pit Lake Containment Berm considered when illustrating the extent of this structure was the containment of floods from within the Pit Lake, however it would also serve to protect the pit lake, if needed.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential effects of future sea-level rise are addressed in Section 5.8.5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. The predicted RSP2100 (sea-level height by 2100 relative to 2007 levels) using the mean sea-level rise was 18 cm, with a possible range of 6 to 30 cm. The predicted RSL2100 using the high predicted sea-level rise was 88 cm, with a possible range of 57 to 118 cm.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3286	675 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	Put the environmental concerns on hold and look at the economic concerns. The plans would grow the pit at work staff with a huge increase on boat traffic at the beginning along with construction work. Labor jobs. Now don't get me wrong there is nothing wrong will skilled trades or jobs but the net employment of the mine is said to be between 12 and 20. That's not a large number of jobs.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3287	675 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>By comparison a single film crew could employ thousands, and as some have commented can spend as much as \$10 million in a summer, leaving no trace either. Will they come with the noise of a rock crusher running 7x24, no. And these jobs Burnco creates, low skill labor. People who will take the job at say 20 something and when the mine closes in 20 years, what? Retire at 40, or get injected into the workforce at 40 something with no skills and dependent on the government (the taxpayers) to retrain them. At best the tax revenue comes close to the cost of reclamation, retraining, remediating what the mining operations leave behind. We've see this story before, we are about to repeat it again.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3288	675 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The only conclusion financially I can make is that this project is NOT good for the people of BC. The company must not be allowed to destroy this habitat in exchange for the paltry revenue that might be generated in lieu of the potential revenue lost.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3289	675 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>So if it fails on the environmental level and the economic level what about claims that this area has always been an industrial area. This is true, but changing. Recall of course that the entire north shore was logged multiple times before it became cottage country. Recreational properties gave way to rural. Residential areas flourished and eventually bridges built. Today the North shore comprises one of the larger municipalities in Greater Vancouver. A Vancouver that has grown to encompass Langley, Surrey, and most recently Squamish is becoming a rural suburb. With the value in land alone the province should be considering this as potential residential growth areas, yet the proposal is to strip 10 time the volume of BC place stadium from a visible and picturesque valley. It just doesn't make sense.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3290	675 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	North Vancouver, BC	<p>The continued push by this company in the face of a major opposition by all parties in the region simply highlights to disparity between Burnco's management's actions and their words.</p> <p>If a reasonable expectation is that our government and process is to express the wishes of the people the only answer here can be NO. No more industrialization in the areas we are expanding to live in.</p> <p>There is no way a reasonable person can mitigate the loss of revenue to the people of the province choosing this mine.</p>	<p>Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3291	676 - 1	Ray Kisser	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Please add the following to the Burnco submissions, the deadline for submissions is October 3, 2016. It is currently 11:20 pm on October 3, 2016 and the form for submissions is not available on the website. This is a serious piece of information regarding the environment at McNab Creek. Lady and gentlemen of Burnco. The pic attached was taken yesterday at McNab.</p> <p>In this message please know that I am one of a significant group of citizens who live in Lions Bay, Howe Sound. We also, because of where we live, enjoy Howe Sound. Every summer, all summer, we take our families over to McNab Creek and enjoy this pristine area. It's not just us though, it's many people who live in what we all refer to as the Sea to Sky Corridor.</p> <p>You would too if you lived here. You would also take your kids here, your kid's kids, and then they would begin the same cycle. The same, very positive cycle, of caring for this planet. Especially the places like McNab Creek.</p> <p>Because of where you live, I can't expect you to really understand this. When I read through all of your corporate history, one point stands out quite clearly. You care a lot about your family history.</p> <p>Well we all do too. And you would if you lived here, and experienced what we all do.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3292	676 - 2	Ray Kisser	Lions Bay, BC	<p>No matter what you believe based on your studies, you will do harm to this area. I am saying you, because although you all work for a company, you directly are making this decision to try to bring your company's plant here.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will provide sand and gravel that will be used to meet the growing demands of the BC marketplace.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
3293	676 - 3	Ray Kisser	Lions Bay, BC	<p>Please go back to your families and look at your kids and grandkids and then quietly ask yourselves, would they understand your decision if you had been taking them to this special place since they were old enough to remember it, and your helped to degrade it?</p> <p>You all know what the answer is. Please, think about what you are doing in this context, not just about how much money you will make.</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3294	677 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed gravel mine at McNabb Creek in Howe Sound British Columbia. First would be McNabb Creek has been logged before without regard for the environment. It is now on its way to recovery and the last thing it needs is a open pit Gravel Mine.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
3295	677 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	I went to the open house in Squamish and it's the same old story we are just going to do it anyway.  The company dressed up their presentation with a lot of pretty pictures showing us how nice it looks but that's the problem. All the pictures are showing us what it looks like now but not what it will look like later. I spoke with one of the companies employees regarding legal requirements and facts I asked how far must the mine be from the creek?  The answer was 100 hundred meters. But because this is law that is the only reason the company will comply and only if they are being watched. This fact of 100 meters is a requirement by law one would think that if the company had good intentions it would show the public a much larger distance between the mine and the creek in good faith. Good faith is defiantly lacking regarding this mining project.  Rather than just the bare minimum I think the company can do better than that.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3296	677 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	<p>I went to the open house in Squamish and it's the same old story we are just going to do it anyway.</p> <p>The company dressed up their presentation with a lot of pretty pictures showing us how nice it looks but that's the problem. All the pictures are showing us what it looks like now but not what it will look like later. I spoke with one of the companies employees regarding legal requirements and facts I asked how far must the mine be from the creek.?</p> <p>The answer was 100 hundred meters. But because this is law that is the only reason the company will comply and only if they are being watched. This fact of 100 meters is a requirement by law one would think that if the company had good intentions it would show the public a much larger distance between the mine and the creek in good faith. Good faith is defiantly lacking regarding this mining project.</p> <p>Rather than just the bare minimum I think the company can do better than that.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3297	677 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	<p>I also looked at all the other environmental facts regarding the risk of this mine. It shows a lot of risk including minimal spills and what the company will do when this happens. The company didn't mention anything about the maximum spills that could happen.</p>	<p>Potential effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events have been assessed. The following potential accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events – and associated mitigation - are presented in Volume 3, Part G – Section 15.4.1 of the EAC Application/EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geohazards: Earthquake-related ground movements and land-based mass movements;</li> <li>- Power outages;</li> <li>- Accidental discharge of sediment or fines into watercourses;</li> <li>- Accidental hazardous material spills – Land and marine based; and</li> <li>- Vessel and barge accidents (e.g., barge capsizing). – Aggregate spills.</li> </ul> <p>Project residual effects of Project-related accidents, malfunctions and unplanned events were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3298	677 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	<p>I also looked at all the other environmental facts regarding the risk of this mine. It shows a lot of risk including minimal spills and what the company will do when this happens. The company didn't mention anything about the maximum spills that could happen.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3299	677 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	The EAO will pass this project like all the others just because the mine company says it will comply with al the environmental request. But once they mine starts there is no going back even if it becomes a environmental disaster. We all know that all the requirements will not be met and some will just be brushed off like no big deal.	The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway. Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.
3300	677 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Whistler, BC	The EAO will pass this project like all the others just because the mine company says it will comply with al the environmental request. But once they mine starts there is no going back even if it becomes a environmental disaster. We all know that all the requirements will not be met and some will just be brushed off like no big deal.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3301	678 - 1	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>I am writing to raise several concerns regarding the potential impact of the planned Burnco gravel mine at the McNab Creek site in Howe Sound.</p> <p>While I lack the expertise to speak to the impacts of this project to the flora and fauna of Howe Sound, the impacts of this project to the human environment of the Sound will be severe and prolonged, if not permanent.</p>	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3302	678 - 2	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>Howe Sound is extensively used for recreational purposes, such as boating, and hiking on an extensive trail network on the eastern edge of the sound, much of which has line-of-sight to the location of the planned mine. The eastern edge of the sound and the islands in the sound are also home to a small but non-trivial population, most of whom live in this area out of a desire for peace and quiet away from most human activity, including industry. The Burnco development is likely to severely impact both categories of people who visit or live in the Howe Sound region.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3303	678 - 3	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>Recreational use will be impacted by the visual pollution created by the mine. Howe Sound is known for its vistas and those vistas will be negatively impacted by the addition of a mine on the scale of the Burnco project. I have seen no data or estimates on the extent recreational use of the Sound will be impacted by the Burnco project but such data ought to be collected and all necessary steps ought to be taken to ensure that recreational use is not disturbed or reduced by the mine. 'All necessary steps,' in my view, may include denying permission for the mine to be built if the impact on recreational use will be too great.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3304	678 - 4	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>The impact on residents will likely be more extensive. The largest community in Howe Sound, Lions Bay, has a direct line of sight to the mine location. The value of Howe Sound properties is highly dependent on views of the natural landscape and will likely be adversely impacted by the destruction of the natural landscape at the mine site. This is even more of a concern in light of the progressive clearcutting of the western shore of the Sound. It may well be the case that the Burnco project constitutes the thin end of the wedge where the views of the landscape in the Sound become perceived not—as they are now—as being overwhelmingly natural, but marred by the occasional clearcut, but rather as being industrial and only blessed with the occasional remains of a natural landscape. Such a change in perception, should it occur, will have negative impacts on property values because it will render the environment of the sound less desirable for human habitation. All necessary steps ought to be taken to minimize such impacts on existing property holders.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3305	678 - 5	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>The most severe impact to existing residents, however, may well be due to noise and vibration from rock crushers and other industrial equipment at the Burnco site. Regional experience from the construction project to upgrade Highway 99 in preparation for the 2010 Olympics is that noise and vibration from rock crushers are disruptively perceptible at distances measured in the tens of kilometres. The prospects of noise pollution from the Burnco project do not appear to have been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>
3306	678 - 6	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>Ongoing noise, and especially vibration, for the duration of the Burnco project would be extremely disruptive to the peacefully quiet environment currently enjoyed by Howe Sound residents. All possible steps ought to be taken to ensure that vibration does not reach even the houses nearest to the mine site under any circumstances and that noise not be audible outside of extremely rare atmospheric conditions.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3307	678 - 7	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>To be frank, I do not believe the Burnco mine project should proceed. The location is far better suited to remain as-is so that the natural beauty of the Howe Sound region can be enjoyed by future generations instead of permanently damaged by an inherently unsustainable non-renewable resource extraction project. However, if the project must proceed, I believe the following conditions ought to be imposed:</p> <p>* Unused areas of the mine pits should be filled in and replanted immediately upon disuse in order to minimize the visual footprint of the mine. Consideration ought to be given to covering as much of the site as is practicable with camouflage netting to further reduce the visual footprint of the mine.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3308	678 - 8	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>* Monitoring and mitigation measures should be implemented to ensure vibration and noise from mine equipment, such as site generator(s) and rock crusher(s), are not perceptible by area residents.</p>	<p>Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.</p>
3309	678 - 9	Coridon Henshaw	Not Stated	<p>Howe Sound is perceived as a natural gem thanks to its quiet natural vistas. This perception and the reality on which it is based is not compatible with large scale industrial development, such as the Burnco project. When taken in the context of continuing clearcutting of the western side of the Sound and the prospect for further re-industrialization at the Woodfibre site, I believe the Burnco project is a step too far that will ruin the character of the sound not just for the 16 years the site is intended to operate but potentially permanently. The mine does not belong here.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3310	679 - 1	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	<p>I wish to voice my concerns regarding the proposed gravel extraction project by Burnco at the McNab Creek area. My concerns are as follows the claim by Burnco representatives that this project is sustainable, the impact that this project could have on the tourist industry in the Howe Sound area, the effects that this project could have on the newly recovered marine life of the sound and the impact of this project on the people who live in the Howe Sound region.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3311	679 - 2	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	<p>At a meeting I attended a Burnco representative claimed that this project would be sustainable. I question how such a project could be sustainable when there is only a finite amount of gravel at this site so how can the extraction be sustainable. Once there is a hole in the ground what will replace the hole?</p>	<p>BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3312	679 - 3	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	At a meeting I attended a Burnco representative claimed that this project would be sustainable. I question how such a project could be sustainable when there is only a finite amount of gravel at this site so how can the extraction be sustainable. Once there is a hole in the ground what will replace the hole?	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3313	679 - 4	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The Howe Sound area relies heavily on the tourist industry bringing in millions of dollars annually to this area. I see the scars from this project being detrimental to the tourist industry. People do not want to see scarred areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3314	679 - 5	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The Howe Sound area relies heavily on the tourist industry bringing in millions of dollars annually to this area. I see the scars from this project being detrimental to the tourist industry. People do not want to see scarred areas.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3315	679 - 6	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	I am also concerned about the impact this project would have on the marine life in the Sound due the noise and the vibrations that would be generated by this project. The marine life in the Sound is only now recovering and the ocean is coming back to health after millions of dollars have been spent on clean up. Why throw all this improvement away?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3316	679 - 7	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3317	679 - 8	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3318	679 - 9	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3319	679 - 10	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The impact of this project will also effect the people who live on the shores of Howe sound with the threat of noise, light visual pollution plus the more marine traffic in the Sound increases the quality of the air in the Sound.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3320	679 - 11	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	Howe Sound is a beautiful place that should be protected from industrial development, not a place where some company like Burnco can come for a short period of time and take away part of the Sound leaving the scars behind for a minimum number of people who may not be hired locally for the duration of the project. The approval of this project could be the thin edge of the wedge for more industrial development on the shores of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3321	679 - 12	Personal Information Withheld	Not Stated	The location for this mine was according to a representative of Burnco was chosen over other alternative sites because they believed there would be less opposition from local people. This seems to me to be sheer arrogance and total disregard for a nation treasure driven by greed on the part of Burnco.	<p>Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>
3322	680 - 1	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	I am writing to express my opposition to the Burnco gravel extraction plan proposed for McNab Creek in Howe Sound. The residents of Howe Sound rely on the maintenance of a thriving tourist industry for their livelihoods and the sustainability of their communities. The proposed gravel mine would severely impact the natural scenic beauty of the area and would have, therefore, a consequent negative effect on the area's major industry. The proposed mine and its activities would, therefore, negatively impact the quality of life of Howe Sound residents.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3323	680 - 2	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>The proposed mine site is situated on the western shore of Howe Sound directly opposite the Sea to Sky Highway, which runs along the eastern shore of the Sound. The Sea to Sky Highway is the only direct land route to Whistler from Vancouver airport and is a direct route from United States/British Columbia border crossings. Hundred of thousands of tourists drive along the Sea to Sky Highway every year on their way to Whistler. This route directly supports and contributes to over one billion dollars per year in tourism income generated by Whistler and the greater Howe Sound area.</p> <p>Given the proposed placement of the Burnco mine, all users of the Sea to Sky Highway—local residents and tourists will see the mine as they drive along the highway.</p> <p>The route of the Sea to Sky Highway was chosen by the province in order to take advantage of the spectacular scenic beauty of Howe Sound.</p> <p>The Sea to Sky Highway is, itself, a major tourist attraction in its own right. The highway supports many small businesses along the Howe Sound corridor. For example, several companies rent out high-end cars to those wishing to experience the unique drive to Whistler—a drive rated as one of the top ten best drives in the world.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3324	680 - 3	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>It makes no economic sense to allow a gravel mine operation to scar an environment which generates billions of dollars in tourist revenue each year. The proposed mine would bring in almost zero benefits to the micro economies of the region, and it would put the province in the position of potentially losing millions of dollars to a vital tourist industry which would then produce a knock-on negative effect to local, provincial and federal economies.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3325	680 - 4	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>I can see no benefit to anyone if this project is allowed to go ahead other than to the balance sheet of a small out of province-based mining company. In my view, the proposal is an example of environmental vandalism driven by corporate greed to the detriment of the local environment and population.</p>	<p>BURNCO is a 104-year old family-owned Canadian company with operations in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas.</p> <p>BURNCO has over 1,150 employees (180 in BC) and is Canada's largest independent ready mix concrete and aggregate company.</p> <p>BURNCO's BC operations currently transport sand and gravel by barge from Treat Creek (east of Powell River) and as far away as Port McNeil on northern Vancouver Island, to existing facilities along the Fraser River in Burnaby and Langley.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3326	680 - 5	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	To claim, as Burnco is attempting to do, that the McNab Creek mine would be 'sustainable' is, in my view, ludicrous. How can a gravel mine be described as 'sustainable'? Gravel is a finite resource. If allowed to go ahead, Burnco's mining operations would last until the resource was exhausted. Once Burnco has extracted both its gravel and its profits, the residents of Howe Sound—human, animal, and vegetable will have to deal with the consequences of the company's actions—potentially for decades ahead.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3327	680 - 6	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	To claim, as Burnco is attempting to do, that the McNab Creek mine would be 'sustainable' is, in my view, ludicrous. How can a gravel mine be described as 'sustainable'? Gravel is a finite resource. If allowed to go ahead, Burnco's mining operations would last until the resource was exhausted. Once Burnco has extracted both its gravel and its profits, the residents of Howe Sound—human, animal, and vegetable will have to deal with the consequences of the company's actions—potentially for decades ahead.	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resource is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3328	680 - 7	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>Those tasked with making the decision about whether or not to allow the McNab gravel pit to go ahead should be aware of the recent history of Howe Sound—specifically, the environmental damage caused by the copper mine at Britannia Beach. It has taken over a decade to revive the waters of Howe Sound and, to the present, \$46 million dollars to clean up its waters so that it once again can support the mammal and fish species we now see in the Sound. Why put this environmental revival at risk for the profit of so few and the detriment to so many?</p> <p>Decision-makers should also be aware that Howe Sound is an area of spectacular natural beauty—an area just outside the bounds of Greater Vancouver and, therefore, easily accessible to millions. Why desecrate this beauty and the joy it gives to both local residents and visitors for the profit of a very few individuals?</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3329	680 - 8	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	The vibrancy and diversity of the aquatic life in Howe Sound is well-documented. It is either a permanent home or an important feeding ground for whales, dolphins, and seals as well as herring and salmon among many other sea creatures.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3330	680 - 9	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	The seabed below Howe Sound is home to glass sponges.	<p>Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3331	680 - 10	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	The banks of McNab Creek are frequented by bear and elk among many other mammals. If the proposed gravel pit goes ahead, it will undoubtedly effect all these species as well as countless others.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3332	680 - 11	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	As important as protecting the natural beauty and sustainability of the creatures of Howe Sound is, it should not be forgotten that the Sound is home to thousands of human residents. Any industrial activity along the shores of the Sound is bound to directly effect the lives and sustainability of its communities.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3333	680 - 12	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	Speaking at an 'information session' for the company's first proposed development plan, a Burnco spokesperson said that the major reason Burnco chose Howe Sound for its expansion was because it contained the smallest population of any of the sites under consideration. Burnco reasoned that, because of the relatively low population of the area, the McNab site would generate less opposition from local residents than would be the case if they chose another site. This argument fails to take into account local conditions and the symbiotic relationship between the population, environment and economic viability of the Howe Sound region.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3334	680 - 13	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>As a resident of Lions Bay, I point out that every single member of this community, (as well as every member of every other community in the Howe Sound region) will be negatively effected should Burnco's gravel extraction plant be approved. I do not think it is an overstatement to say that the existence of Lions Bay, as it is at present, is threatened if any industrial development in Howe Sound takes place.</p> <p>Communities along Howe Sound are not all bastions of wealth as is commonly thought. They are struggling isolated communities with small tax bases and, because of their mountainous locations, huge infrastructure and maintenance bills. For example, the village of Lions Bay is not self-sustainable. With a population of only 1,318, Lions Bay can raise only a small portion of the monies it needs to maintain a safe infrastructure up to required standards. As such, it relies on government grants to finance even its most basic needs such as a clean sustainable water supply, sewage management and urgent road and bridge repairs.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3335	680 - 14	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3336	680 - 15	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3337	680 - 16	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	The proposed gravel extraction pit would be located directly across from Lions Bay. It would be visible to almost every resident; its operations may be heard in every household; it lights would be visible at night in almost every window; and, the plant's vibrations could be felt through every foundation in the village.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.
3338	680 - 17	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	In addition to the deterioration in their quality of life caused by the above effects, Lions Bay residents would also face financial disadvantage due to lowered house prices as a result of visual and noise pollution. Lions Bay has already suffered negative impacts due to the location of Highway 99, which runs through the heart of the village. Average house prices in Lions Bay are already significantly lower than in almost every other municipality and district on the North Shore. If even less potential house buyers view Lions Bay (and other effected communities) as a desirable place to buy a house, the tax base will shrink even further, more houses will be left vacant and Lions Bay may become nothing more than an unsustainable ghost town. Given the realities facing the community, the village of Lions Bay stands to lose the most of any constituency and will gain nothing by a Burnco development. In short, any industrialization on the McNab Creek site will erode the viability of Lions Bay as a sustainable community.	Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.  The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).  BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3339	680 - 18	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>In the larger picture, granting Burnco's application for the McNab Creek mine makes no economic sense. It will put the province in the position of potentially losing millions of dollars to a vital tourist industry. It will effect local, provincial and federal economies all in the name of supporting corporate greed. Burnco has stated that the gravel mine will support twelve jobs. There is no guarantee that these jobs will be filled locally, as far as I am aware. However, twelve jobs is a very, very expensive price to pay for the loss of environmental habit, species diversity, quality of life for thousands of people not to mention the jeopardy such development will place on billions of dollars of income from tourism. It is, in my view, senseless, for such a project to go ahead given its costs.</p>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3340	680 - 19	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	<p>I submit that no industrial development be permitted in Howe Sound—an area worthy of provincial, federal and international heritage site protection. Instead, I submit that the entire Howe Sound region should be comprehensively studied with the aim of maintaining and protecting this wonderful resource for the people of Canada.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3341	680 - 20	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	If shortsightedness prevails and this act of environmental vandalism is approved, I submit that Burnco should be required to provide quantifiable data to show that its development and operational activities of its McNab site will have no negative effects, such as vibrations, noise or lights, on all co-habiting creatures including those in surrounding communities.	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3342	680 - 21	Pauline Brider	Not Stated	If shortsightedness prevails and this act of environmental vandalism is approved, I submit that Burnco should be required to provide quantifiable data to show that its development and operational activities of its McNab site will have no negative effects, such as vibrations, noise or lights, on all co-habiting creatures including those in surrounding communities.	BURNCO will develop a project-specific website that will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed regarding the Project, including project schedule, construction activities, operating information, and noise and air quality monitoring data.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3343	681 - 1	Nancy	Not Stated	<p>Hello;</p> <p>I would like to add my voice to those that would like to see Howe Sound continue on it's path to recovery. Like many others I live on the Sea to Sky Corridor. Like many others too I have cancer. Fortunately I am in remission for an advanced, aggressive and atypical form of lymphoma. Currently I am healthy and very happy spending time doing what I love - being outdoors kayaking, walking,,birdwatching. Every day I am so grateful to be alive. To live in such a wonderful place and be so connected to nature and the land. I draw strength from our place of land, sea and sky. On my trips to and from the Cancer Agency and hospital I drink in Howe Sound. It fills me up and settles me.</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3344	681 - 2	Nancy	Not Stated	<p>I take delight in the whale sightings, the news of the recovering Elk population, the annual migration of both sea and songbirds.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3345	681 - 3	Nancy	Not Stated	<p>I take delight in the whale sightings, the news of the recovering Elk population, the annual migration of both sea and songbirds.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3346	681 - 4	Nancy	Not Stated	The Burnco Gravel mine is one more industry that will irrevocably alter Howe Sound and undo much good that has taken place in recent years. Twelve full time jobs are not worth the effect it will have on the McNabb estuary. It is with great sadness I have seen the redwing blackbird nesting grounds at Nexen Beach be bulldozed under for the new oceanfront development. To hear their song at twilight was absolutely magical. Now no more.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3347	681 - 5	Nancy	Not Stated	I know that 12 jobs would be created by the mine. This is small number of jobs. Surely we have the potential of creating far more jobs in the tourism and recreation sectors if we keep Howe Sound as a jewel to showcase to the rest of the world. A world thirsting for the natural world. It is a place of healing. A sanctuary. Let's strive to keep it so.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3348	681 - 6	Nancy	Not Stated	I know that 12 jobs would be created by the mine. This is small number of jobs. Surely we have the potential of creating far more jobs in the tourism and recreation sectors if we keep Howe Sound as a jewel to showcase to the rest of the world. A world thirsting for the natural world. It is a place of healing. A sanctuary. Let's strive to keep it so.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3349	682 - 1	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Please find my comments concerning the Burnco proposal for McNab creek in the attached file.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3350	682 - 2	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comments to Environmental Assessment Office regarding Burnco Aggregate Project McNab Creek, Howe Sound, BC Submitted October 3, 2016</p> <p>Mr. Johan Huibert Anton van Walraven 351 Eagles Nest Rd, Bowen Island, BC V0N1G1</p> <p>Background Ingenieur degree Industrial Design (7 year Master degree equivalent), Technical University of Delft, the Netherlands (1984-1991) 1992 – 1999 Graphic design, industrial design and architectural IT consultant. 2001 – 2009 Staff forest campaign, volunteer coordination and IT (Western Canada) Wilderness Committee, Vancouver BC Resident, Bowen Island, 2003 - present Member of lead team Concerned Citizens Bowen – ccbowen.ca, 2015 - present Member of volunteer research team regarding Herring spawn in Upper Howe Sound and possible effects of Woodfibre LNG's Once Through Cooling System proposal on Herring Spawn, August 2015 - present.</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3351	682 - 3	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 1: The environmental Assessment process has been recognized to be 'broken' and its results to be lacking the public trust. One of the reasons EA process is considered 'broken' is due to the fact that the regulator's job is to judge the merits of the project proponents conclusions, and to be relying in their judgment on the work of the public during the public comment process, and the members of the Working Group. Both public comment process and Working Group participants lack time and resources to adequately do their work. (Acknowledged by Golder Associate representatives at the Burnco Information session on September 14 2016 in West Vancouver).</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3352	682 - 4	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>- As of to date Burnco Rock Products Ltd. and its principal officers has, since July 27 2006, donated \$ 286,700 to the BC Liberal party, the party that has formed the BC Government since 2001. (Source Elections BC)</p> <p>- On November 24 2013, more than a year before the Environmental Assessment of the Woodfibre LNG project started, the Province of B.C. posted a video on youtube.com concerning a trade trip for Premier Clark to China. We hear the Premier speaking and this is part of the transcript: "I just came back from Rudong, Jiangsu Province near Shanghai. I saw the most incredible feat of engineering you will find in just about anywhere. The longest LNG pipeline in the world overland. It goes out about 20 kilometers, out from the shore. So they can receive LNG from around the world, AND THAT IS WHERE we are going to connect Squamish British Columbia to...China. As Woodfibre [LNG] build their facility in B.C. to export natural gas...over here [China]." <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwB2tN9xly8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwB2tN9xly8</a></p> <p>- As of to date, Woodfibre LNG and its principal officers have donated \$91, 689 to the BC Liberal party. (Source Elections BC)</p> <p>- How could the Premier make this statement with the clear emphasis and conviction that Squamish would connect to China through the natural gas exports of Woodfibre LNG?</p> <p>- The Environmental Assessment of the Woodfibre LNG project was flawed and clearly rigged, as the video proves, even before the assessment of the project started.</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3353	682 - 5	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 1.1: How can the public be certain that the recommendations coming out of the Environmental Assessment process properly reflect the real impact this proposal would have on the McNab creek estuary?</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3354	682 - 6	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 1.2: How can we trust that a Minister, whose party has received \$ 286,700 in donations from a company, will make a fair and unbiased decision, when the track record of this BC government shows an all together different pattern?</p>	Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3355	682 - 7	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 2: Estuaries deliver invaluable ecosystem services. The entire Howe Sound inlet has very limited wild and functional estuary. McNab Creek is the second largest estuary in Howe Sound that is still functional, while the other estuaries in Howe Sound were destroyed and replaced by urban or industrial development (Britania beach, Horseshoe Bay, Snug Cove Bowen Island, Mill creek at Woodfibre, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estuaries provide ecosystem services that are fundamental life-support processes upon which all organisms depend (Daily et al., 1997). Two ecosystem services that estuaries provide are water filtration and habitat protection.</li> <li>- McNab Creek is the second largest estuary of the few remaining natural estuaries in Howe Sound.</li> <li>- Estuaries form a tiny portion of Howe Sound's total shoreline but are its richest shoreline habitats in terms of biodiversity and biological productivity.</li> <li>- In the Howe Sound and broader context estuaries deserve the highest protection.</li> <li>- 'The options for adequate fish habitat compensation within McNab Creek or even the greater Howe Sound area are severely limited and may not allow the proposed development to meet DFO's fish habitat policy objectives, including the "No Net Loss" guiding principle' (DFO letter to Burnco R.P. Ltd – June 27 2011).</li> </ul> <p>Question 2.1: What is the justification for destroying 75% of the McNab estuary indefinitely when estuaries are regarded as seriously crucial to marine life and very few estuaries are found in Howe</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3356	682 - 8	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 3. ..Distinction must be made between 'the need of the market for gravel' in general and the economical opportunity that wet-mining of gravel from McNab Creek would provide to Burnco. Howe Sound has been 'explored' before and some deposits are already depleted. In absence of careful planning for supply aggregates for the Lower Mainland , question marks should be placed with appropriateness of pursuing this project in a functioning estuary.</p> <p>The 'Need for the project' is described in the earlier project description dated December 26, 2011. Although the project description is not part of the submission, it is found on the EAO ePic webpage for the Burnco submission. The document is crucial since it provides Burnco's rationale for pursuing the project in McNab creek.</p> <p>- In the chapter 'Need for the project' it is stated: 'With the steady growth of the population of BC's South Coast, along with continued depletion of existing local aggregate supplies, there is a need to locate and develop new sources of aggregate in proximity to the Lower Mainland. The relative cost of aggregate is often low, but transportation costs are high, often eclipsing the cost of the product. Shipping by water is the most cost-effective way of transporting aggregate products, and shipping short distances by water further reduces environmental and societal costs.'</p> <p>- The need for aggregates is clear, but it is unclear how planning initiatives, like the 'Aggregate and Demand – Update and Analyses', Nov 2013, prepared for the Regional District of Central</p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Wet mining is the selected mining method because of the proximity of the aggregate deposit relative to the existing water table. Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3357	682 - 9	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 4. (Adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Burnco proposal largely blocks the animal corridor between upper McNab valley and shoreline, functionally disconnecting estuary from uplands. The proposal intends to fill three quarters of the lower one kilometer of the McNab Creek valley with a 24/7 industrial operation that will alienate that area from wildlife, and spread industrial noise throughout the lower valley for at least the project lifetime. It is inconceivable that this industrial noise and land alienation will not greatly limit the function of the lower valley as habitat and greatly disconnect migration of mammals such as elk, black bear, wolves, and grizzly bear between upper valley and the shore. Local observations show the estuary is heavily used by elk and black bear, and occasionally by grizzly bear and wolves. I have visited McNab Creek many times and have seen the tracks.</p> <p>Question 4.1: How will the project proposal offset the project impacts on elk, bear and wolf migration along the valley floor from upper valley to estuary?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3358	682 - 10	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 4.2: Given ongoing forestry operations in McNab Creek valley, and extensive past cutting of valley floor forests, and recent construction of the Box Canyon power project, how does the additional impact of the Burnco proposal relate to the cumulative impacts of other past and ongoing industry in the valley?</p> <p>Question 4.3: What cumulative effects assessment has been made of ecosystem health of the McNab Creek valley?</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3359	682 - 11	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 5: Proposed 'reclamation' plan narrow in scope and fails to identify what an estuary is. The 'reclamation' plan is designed in terms of growing forests, fails to recognize the need for providing area for the main creek to wander across its natural floodplain over time. The use of the word of reclamation, which refers to land, should be considered inappropriate and misleading, when 75% of the effected area is turned into a lake.</p> <p>- Within Canada it is understood that reclamation means "The process of reconvertng disturbed land to its former or other productive uses." (Powter, Chris, 2002).</p> <p>- The inventory of the soil across the area where the lake would be dug, is narrow in scope. It classifies the soil in terms of being good or poor, which should not be surprising since we are dealing with an estuary. The soil quality distribution across the flat floodplain signifies an estuary, in which the creek has wandered, had different creek beds and deposited sediments in changing areas over time. To project the model of a forest onto an area that is an estuary is odd and would do nothing in terms of reclamation, unless one prefers forests over estuaries.</p> <p>- In contrast with reality, subsequent B.C. governments and their ministries of Forests have declared over time that clearcut logging of old-growth forest, would be adequately replaced by tree planting and to follow second growth forests would be an equivalent replacement. The clearcut logging of Old growth, and subsequent logging of second growth in rotation cycles leads to the known "Falldown" effect on forests. (soil degradation, loss of biodiversity, lack of ability to grow forest – report: Kellogg, R.M.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities. See responses to specific questions below.</p>
3360	682 - 12	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 5.1 Is the downgrade of forest capability from Class 1 forest to Class 3 forest in some parts of the McNab estuary an acknowledgement that forest practices in B.C. are indeed highly destructive practices, a misunderstanding of the soil composition you would expect to find in an estuary, or is the reclassification from Class 1 forest to Class 3 a self-serving exercise?</p> <p>Question 5.2: Why is the reclamation plan not based on reestablishing a Class 1 forest after closure?</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3361	682 - 13	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Question 5.3: Why is there no mention of the mature forest areas that will be cleared for the Processing/Stockpiles Area at the shoreface?</p>	<p>We recognize that soils mapping was conducted at a reconnaissance level and based on existing geotechnical borehole and test pit data and existing publically available soils maps. We believe that this information was sufficient for EAC Application/EIS that required LSA soils mapping at a 1:5000-scale.</p> <p>Subsequent soil surveys including additional soil plot locations in the Processing Area, plus select soil sample collection and analytical testing for soil quality will be completed prior to surface preparation. This information combined with the preliminary EAC Application/EIS soils mapping and geotechnical subsurface data will be used to prepare updated soil maps and soil salvage and reclamation plans as required for the BURNCO Mines Act Permit Application (MAPA).</p> <p>Mature forest areas that will be cleared are noted in Volume 2, Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS: The Proposed Project will remove approximately 3.3% (4 ha) of mature coniferous forest for the marine conveyor belt system in the LSA.</p>
3362	682 - 14	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 6: (partly adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) The project will permanently isolate McNab Creek from migration across the majority of its natural floodplain. The suggestion that the pitlake would not effect flow levels in McNab creek is based on the premis of adequate precipitation to sustain an 'overpressure' on the area east of the lake and prevent 'leaking' from the Creek into the lake.</p> <p>The natural habit of the river is to wander back and forth across its natural floodplain and estuary. Berms surrounding the proposed pit will permanently restrict McNab Creek to the eastern margin of the estuary. The berms will isolate the Creek from three quarters of its natural fan delta, removing the Creek's ability to directly replenish sediment to the western part of the estuary and create diverse habitats. Given ongoing sea level rise, forecast to be at least 1 m rise by 2100, this lack of direct sedimentation to the western estuary will increase the risk of shoreline erosion, wet meadow and tidal flat erosion, and shoreline retreat, with consequent valuable habitat loss throughout this area.</p> <p>- The 'Historic Climate Analyses for Howe Sound' (Burnco EA App. Appendix 5.8-A) is limited to the West side of Howe Sound and limited to the period 1971 to 2010. Since 2010 we are experiencing the effects of climate change with dryer conditions in South Western B.C., characterized by longer spells of dry weather and alternated by sudden burst of precipitation. During these burst, the rain water tends to flow off rather than being absorbed by the soil and to cause soil erosion.</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3363	682 - 15	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 6.2: Will the sudden rising levels of the pitlake caused by precipitation burst demand the release of large amounts of water into the rearing channel projected to replace Water Course 2?	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p>
3364	682 - 16	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 6.3: Would the need for releases due to precipitation burst overwhelm the proposed new rearing channel that is calculated to withstand a few artificial freshet events(lake releases) per year?	<p>During the operational phase of the Project the water level in the pit will be monitored but not be actively managed. Mining operational activities will need to accommodate fluctuations in the Pit Lake water levels. The owner shall monitor the groundwater gradient and the water levels within the pit lake. These monitored groundwater and pit lake water levels shall be used to refine the analysis of the closure groundwater gradient and pit lake water level. These analysis shall be used to inform the progressive planning of the mine. After closure, if necessary, the groundwater gradient can be altered (varying the rate of loss from McNab Creek) by adjusting the height of the weir at the outlet of the pit lake.</p> <p>The Pit Lake water levels provided in Table 5.5-7 (Volume 2 Section 5.5), include consideration of surface water and groundwater inflows and groundwater outflows from the Pit Lake on an average annual basis. Additional analysis indicated that during extreme wet periods ranging in duration from days to months, the increased rates of surface water and groundwater inflow would result in Pit Lake water levels in excess of the values presented in Table 5.5-7. Under these conditions the rate of groundwater outflow would also increase above those predicted under annual average conditions. The height of the Pit Lake Containment Berm was designed in order to contain the elevated Pit Lake water levels that would result from extreme prolonged wet periods. Details of the analysis and design of the Pit Lake Containment Berm will be provided in the Mines Act Application.</p> <p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3365	682 - 17	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 7: Replacement of Water Course 2 by new to build artificial rearing channel</p> <p>Water Course 2 (WC2) was built to compensate for the dredging Rainy River's natural spawning and rearing fish habitat. The dredging was done to allow marine traffic for the Howe Sound Pulp and Paper. The reasons for the building of WC2 are not mentioned in the Burnco's EA application. With the lack of options to compensate for fish habitat in Howe Sound, the location of McNab creek was chosen. The artificial channel that was built following design specifications of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WC2 lacks appropriate shading from trees, this will effect water temperature levels.</li> <li>- It is dubious that the artificial WC2 would qualify as adequate compensation of lost or damaged natural fish habitat at Rainy River.</li> <li>- The replacement of WC2 takes away any area for possible compensation for the negative effects caused by the mining operation on McNab creek itself.</li> <li>- The premises of sufficient precipitation is based on dated records (see comment 6).</li> <li>- It is no far stretch to conclude that the mining operation and the dykes needed to 'protect' lake from a course change of the creek will effect flow quantities in McNab Creek due to the changing precipitation patterns caused by climate change.</li> </ul> <p>Question 7.1: How would Burnco compensate for Serious Harm to fish in McNab creek caused by the caging McNab Creek to its</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3366	682 - 18	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 8: ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Inappropriate location for a Processing/Stockpiles Area At McNab, a forest 30-300m wide of second growth sitka spruce-hemlock forest 80-250 years old fringes the entire estuary shoreline. This mature forest is an essential element of the estuary, forming a natural transition between upland and wet meadow-tidal flats of the intertidal estuary. The entire one kilometer of estuary shoreline with fringing forest, intertidal marsh and mud-sand-cobble tidal flats intact at McNab Creek. This coastal strip is the most valuable and sensitive part of the estuary.</p> <p>The Processing/Stockpiles Area is proposed within the fringing forest of this coastal strip. This will require clearing of a large tract of mature second growth 80-250 year old hemlock-sitka spruce forest. This forest zone is 150-200m wide at the Processing/Stockpiles Area site and all but a sliver-thin buffer will be lost.</p> <p>Question 8.1: Why is the processing facility not located inland, north of the power line, and well back from the most ecologically sensitive area of the estuary?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project was thoughtfully designed to be environmentally responsible, sensitive to the environment of the proposed site while making use of existing conditions. Since the initial design, the project has changed considerably. Revisions and refinements have been made in response to our Project Team's feedback and to comments and concerns raised by regulatory agencies, Aboriginal Groups and the public.</p> <p>A few examples of project considerations, and subsequent changes and components designed to address feedback received to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using existing BC Hydro lines to electrically powered equipment to extract, process and load the aggregate resource to limit exhaust emissions from the burning of fossil fuels;</li> <li>- Revised the size and location of the processing area to avoid identified fish habitat and to mitigate potential noise effects.</li> <li>- Revised stockpile location and design to limit potential operational noise effects.</li> <li>- Refined berm design and location to limit potential noise and air quality effects.</li> <li>- Maintained tree buffer on foreshore to limit noise effects, dust emissions, and visual effects.</li> </ul> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3367	682 - 19	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 9 : ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597]) Environmental bonding Given the high ecological values of McNab Creek estuary, and the large impacts this proposal will impose on the estuary, and the critical role that estuaries play in Howe Sound, this proposal also poses serious risks to the larger ecosystem health of Howe Sound. Should a mine go ahead, it is critical that environmental reclamation and monitoring of reclamation works be successful to the highest standards. To ensure reclamation compliance, and public confidence that this will indeed be achieved, significant environmental bonds need to be in place.</p> <p>Question 9.1: What criteria are being used to evaluate the necessary level of environmental bonding for reclamation? Question 9.2: What amount of reclamation bonding is required of the proponent before start of works?</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3368	682 - 20	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Comment 10: ( adopted from Dr. Bob Turner [Ref 407 and 597] and added) This project will expand industrial activity to a new greenfield site in Howe Sound. This project is not compatible with the ongoing recovery of Howe Sound from past industrial activity, nor its recreational use. Is this the highest and best use for Howe Sound?</p> <p>It is widely recognized that Howe Sound was extensively damaged by past industrial activity and several aggregate deposits in Howe Sound are already depleted. Over the past 30 years, advances in environmental legislation and closure and remediation of past industrial sites has reduced pollution in Howe Sound. A recovery of marine life over the past 15 years, and particularly over the past 5 years, is indicated by the greatly increased presence of whales, dolphins, pink and Chinook salmon, and herring and anchovy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Province has invested heavily in this enterprise, not the least of which are the ongoing costs of managing Britannia Mine effluent.</li> <li>- Britania Beach Contamination Cleanup near Squamish to cost \$99Million (Vancouver Sun June 10 2006) (Article removed from Vancouver Sun website , but posted here: <a href="http://www.6717000.com/blog/2006/06/britania-beach-contamination-cleanup-nearsquamish-to-cost-99m/">http://www.6717000.com/blog/2006/06/britania-beach-contamination-cleanup-nearsquamish-to-cost-99m/</a> )</li> <li>- As a consequence of all these changes, and the increasing demands of the growing population of metropolitan Vancouver, recreational use of Howe Sound has increased dramatically. A new industrial operation on a new greenfield site with significant ecological impacts is out of step with these trends.</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
3369	682 - 21	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	<p>Currently, the footprint of industry (except for forestry) is absent from the entire 25 km long western shore of Howe Sound from Port Mellon to Woodfibre. Northern Thornborough Channel is a prime recreational area for boaters. The noise and visual impacts from the proposed project would be a significant intrusion on the recreational values of this area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3370	682 - 22	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.1: What criteria suggest that this proposal is compatible with the "highest and best use" of the McNab Creek estuary and northern Thorborough Channel?	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3371	682 - 23	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.2: What criteria suggest that the impacts of this proposal will not be detrimental to the ongoing recovery of marine ecosystems of Howe Sound?	It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).  Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3372	682 - 24	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Question 10.3: What criteria suggest there is a need for pitlake when we have Howe Sound?	Alternatives to the Proposed Project and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Also included are alternative means of carrying out the Proposed Project (e.g., alternative locations, transportation, mine layout, processing, loading and barging layouts, and mining methods). Criteria considered in the alternative assessment are environmental effects, social effects, cost effectiveness, and technical applicability.
3373	682 - 25	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	Overall conclusion: - With the changing weather patterns due to climate changes. Patterns of dry spells alternated by precipitation burst, are being reported everywhere around the world.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3374	682 - 26	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- The idea to dig a pit mine in an area that is the floodplain of an existing salmon and trout bearing creek and build a dyke to prevent the creek from changing course, will translate into a permanent situation were the creek and every fish living it will be exposed to a combination of low flow levels and very high flow levels.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.
3375	682 - 27	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- The ability of the creek to self-mediate through flooding and/or changing course will be lost. Therefore the possibility of Serious Harm to fish should be seriously considered.	An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.  The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B).

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3376	682 - 28	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- In the larger context, hundreds of Salmons stocks in B.C. have gone extinct due to bad logging practices. Stream and river keepers having been working hard to rebuild salmon habitat. In light of this it seems odd that a healthy Salmon and trout bearing stream would be unnecessarily exposed to the possibility of Serious Harm.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3377	682 - 29	Anton van Walraven	Bowen Island, BC	- Howe Sound has been exposed to enough industrial activity and has given up enough aggregate deposits. Time to let it heal.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3378	683 - 1	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	This letter is being submitted as a result of your request for public comment on the Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Burnco Rock Products regarding its proposal for an open pit mine at McNabb Creek. While we have significant concerns that this is a highly flawed and biased process, we have no option but to “play the game” and “trust in the process”.	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3379	683 - 2	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Burnco Rock Product’s (Burnco’s) proposed, large, open-pit aggregate mine and crushing facility is clearly contrary to regional commitments and development efforts in the area, and more importantly it is completely inconsistent with the established use of the area for primarily leisure purposes.	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3380	683 - 3	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3381	683 - 4	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound is a unique wilderness area and McNab sits in the middle of it. Located only 45min from urban Vancouver, Howe Sound is a world away from city life. Most global cities have lost their access to nature close to the urban core, but here, in Vancouver, we are privileged to have the wilderness on our doorstep, we should not take it for granted. We cannot ignore the physical and mental health benefits derived to the urban population from easy access to wilderness areas like Howe Sound. These benefits do not appear represented in any assessment of the proposed mine, but they should, human physical and mental health is key to a healthy and sustainable city.	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3382	683 - 5	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The proposed open pit mine should not be considered in isolation. The cumulative impact of other projects in the area need to form part of this assessment. In May 2015 the Auditor General of BC issued a report with nine recommendations and stated "it's in the interest of British Columbians to address cumulative effects management without delay" Howe Sound was selected as one of the Province's first regions for Cumulative Effects Assessment under the new framework.</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3383	683 - 6	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>While the economic return will accrue to Burnco and a small number of local businesses, significant socio-economic costs and environmental damage to Howe Sound will be borne by the communities and residents of the area and the taxpayers of British Columbia who will derive little benefit from the project. The mine will generate only 12 full time jobs at around \$25/hr, similar to a less experienced construction worker. The aggregate itself may well replace aggregate from other parts of BC and thus the jobs may not be "net new" employment but rather "replacement employment", there is no benefit in this.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>
3384	683 - 7	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Environmental Impacts</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3385	683 - 8	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3386	683 - 9	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3387	683 - 10	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Howe Sound has a history of industrial abuse and is only now seeing return of marine mammal and fish life. In the past six years, whales and dolphins have been observed in the Sound for the first time in over a decade and herring and salmon have become increasingly abundant. This proposed project could clearly have a significant negative impact on marine wildlife and their habitat and freshwater fish and their habitat. There are only 3 estuaries in all of Howe Sound. They act as a nursery for prawns, scallops, oysters, rock-fish, salmon and countless other types of marine life. The harm from this proposed project to McNab's valley and alluvial fan and the habitat that rely on it cannot be overstated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3388	683 - 11	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>In fact, Oceans and Fisheries Canada (aka DFO) has already rejected such proposals in the past. With respect to the Burnco project, In June of 2010, DFO determined that the project would result in harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (“HADD”) of fish habitat that cannot be compensated elsewhere in the Sound. As such DFO advised Burnco that DFO was not prepared to issue a HADD authorization.</p> <p>In response, I understand Burnco filed a judicial review application against DFO in Supreme Court. Subsequently, DFO agreed to participate in a full environmental review. However, in June, 2011, DFO issued a letter in which they stated that they “continue to have serious concerns about the extent of the impacts to fish and fish habitat that may result from this project” and that “The project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat.”</p>	<p>Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO’s involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.</p> <p>Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3389	683 - 12	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3390	683 - 13	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3391	683 - 14	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3392	683 - 15	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3393	683 - 16	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	There are major concerns from stakeholders throughout Howe Sound about the crushing and loading facilities and associated noise, glare from industrial lighting, vibrations, dust, emissions and destruction or damage to wildlife habitat both terrestrial and aquatic.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3394	683 - 17	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>A 2012 research project by Vancouver Aquarium found that the foreshore area directly in front of the proposed project is a marine rich habitat and an important and rare nursery area for various aquatic habitat.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>
3395	683 - 18	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Burnco's Consultant's, Golder and Associates, clearly show in their assessments dust blooms extending far out to sea which over the 16 years of this projects lifetime will cause harmful silt and sediment build up across the foreshore area. The extent of these dust blooms directly contradict other Golder assurances that spraying mitigations will eliminate such dust blooms in the first place. Clearly Golder needs to do further work to get reconcile their opinions.</p> <p>The area can be very exposed to extreme wind conditions which are difficult to predict and monitor. The proponents air quality report shows particulate matter over the marine environment but the marine assessment contradicts this by saying there will be no sediment seems a little incongruous. We need to ensure that should the project go ahead this particulate matter is evaluated on a continuous basis both through air quality monitoring and monitoring of the marine ecosystems around the project. A build-up of silt in the marine environment cannot be allowed, over the course of the project it would destroy local marine life.</p>	<p>The air quality dispersion model predictions presented in Figures 5.7-2, 5.7-3, 5.7-4 and 5.7-5 represent in-air concentrations of particulate matter fractions and not predictions of dust deposition; the concentrations presented do not represent dust plumes. In addition, the dispersion modelling methods and associated assumptions - approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) - incorporated a high degree of conservatism. The air dispersion model was based on worst case daily emission rates and assumed worst case daily emissions every day of the year. These assumptions contributed to the high level of confidence in the air quality assessment predictions that there will no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The same Ministry-approved CALPUFF model that was used to predict air quality concentrations (i.e., run in dynamic [3D] mode with a fine resolution meteorological data set) was used to predict deposition rates which were incorporated into the surface water quality model and the assessment of potential effects on water quality and aquatic health. With the effective implementation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs, the potential residual effects on water quality and aquatic health were determined to be negligible and not significant. Proposed mitigation for controlling the release of dust to the aquatic environment including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing and implementing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan that will detail measures to control fugitive particulates.</li> <li>- Developing and implementing an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.</li> <li>- Establishing an on-site Air Quality and Meteorology Monitoring Program.</li> <li>- Fines/silt cakes berm should be vegetated as soon as possible and where possible by planting and seeding with native trees, shrubs, and grasses.</li> <li>- Placement of erosion control blankets on the berm to prevent dust.</li> <li>- Sediment and erosion control measures should be maintained at all times around the crushing areas and until vegetation is achieved on the berm.</li> <li>- Processing plant crushing and dry screening units will be partially enclosed.</li> <li>- Watering of 10 mm crushed gravel and 20 mm crush gravel stockpiles.</li> <li>- Watering of unpaved roads and restricting speed limits</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3396	683 - 19	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder Associates also indicate the site could be home to up to 21 Species at Risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk that were transplanted to McNab Creek by the BC Ministry of Environment in 2001 in an effort to re-introduce the species to the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3397	683 - 20	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	The current value of the McNabb area as salmon bearing habitat is downplayed in the proponent's report. Our own experience has been of a rejuvenation in fish stocks at McNab, reflecting the fish recovery seen elsewhere in Howe Sound. Greater scrutiny around this part of the report is necessary to reflect the true value of the creek as a salmon habitat.	<p>A description and quantification of potential spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 is provided in section 3.1.3.1 of Appendix 5.1-A and in Table 6 of the same appendix. A spawner survey conducted on 13 November 2016 re-affirmed the baseline description and observed less than 200 m2 of suitable salmonid spawning habitat based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth (&gt; 18cm).</p> <p>As described in section 3.1.3.2 of Appendix 5.1-A the lower section of WC2 consists of low gradient run and pool habitat with exposed gravels present in the runs and fines occurring in the pool areas. The distribution of pool to run habitat is approximately 1/1 along the length of the lower section. There is approximately 3,920 m2 of wetted area in the lower section of WC2 suggesting that there is approximately 1960 m2 of run habitat that may be suitable for spawning, based on the presence of exposed gravels and adequate depth. During the 13 November 2016 spawner survey chum salmon were observed to be spawning in the available run habitat present in the lower section of the channel (Figure 1, 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat).</p> <p>The Fish Habitat Offset Plan proposes to create more than 5,000 m2 of additional groundwater-fed channel habitat with approximately a 1/1 ration of pool to run habitat. The offset channel extension uses the design of the existing lower channel as a template so it is reasonable to expected that approximately 2,500 m2 of the new habitat will have conditions similar to the run habitat present in the existing channel where chum salmon were observed to be spawning.</p> <p>A 30-Dec-2016 Technical Memo entitled BURNCO Aggregate Project: Additional Information Regarding Watercourse Two (WC2), Fish and Fish Habitat provides the results of 2016 spawner surveys for WC2 and a description of salmonid species utilization of habitat provided by groundwater-fed channels.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3398	683 - 21	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Even if Burnco make the best possible effort, there is no way they will be able to significantly mitigate the noise from loading millions of tonnes of aggregate into steel hulled barges. Noise and vibrations have been found to disturb large marine mammals' communication, navigation and food-finding abilities, and are increasingly believed to impact their fertility. Sadly, if Burnco is allowed to proceed with this mine, we can expect the dolphins, orcas, and grey whales to vacate the area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3399	683 - 22	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	An artificial lake is not a reasonable remediation to replace the habitat for the displaced wildlife.	<p>The pit lake is not proposed as mitigation for habitat loss. Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>
3400	683 - 23	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	We find it difficult to believe that there will be no audible impact from the project on the north end of Gambier Island. Given the natural topography of the area and the fact that noise travels very clearly across water we have significant concerns about the noise of the barge loading in particular which we believe will have a significant negative impact of the peaceful nature of the area for humans as well as for marine and terrestrial life. While talking to representatives from Golder at the Open House in West Vancouver in September 2016 it became clear that the noise impact had been modelled with little firsthand knowledge of the area impacted; the lead representative on noise impact admitted he had never been onsite.	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Considering these factors, the modelled Project contributions to noise levels at NR4 (Eakins Point, inside the LSA and across the water from the Project) were below baseline and resulted in Negligible-Not Significant effects.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners, including receptors across the water such as Eakins Point.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3401	683 - 24	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	The noise values expected from the Golder models were considered to be acceptable to urban and industrial settings; the study area is neither as it is primarily recreational.	<p>The Commission Guideline defines a pristine area as: "A pure, natural area that might have a dwelling but no industrial presence, including energy, agricultural, forestry, manufacturing, recreational, or other industries that already impact the noise environment."</p> <p>McNab Creek is not considered to be a pristine because there is a known industrial presence activity (i.e. logging), as well as known recreation use of the area (e.g., boating, hunting). There is also a run-of-river power project in close proximity.</p>
3402	683 - 25	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3403	683 - 26	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	Golder has much work to do to assist Burnco in measuring and evaluating the impact of their project on the marine and terrestrial mammals resident and using the area!	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3404	683 - 27	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>A number of areas of the EIS identify possible environmental impacts of the project but allude to these being addressed by “best management practices”. There are significant concerns around approving a development with clear environmental risks based on the “hope” that best environmental practices will be adhered to. The resources available at the BCEAO for oversight of such projects seem fairly limited from a resource perspective (5-6 people cover the province). What is to stop the proponent from ignoring “best practise” and declining to follow mitigation strategies? The experience of residents adjacent to the Cougar Ridge Mine in Calgary, Alberta owned and operated by Burnco does not suggest that Burnco can be guaranteed to be a “good neighbour”.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors’ environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3405	683 - 28	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p><b>Economic Impacts</b> While the project will create 12 full time jobs, it will jeopardize far more jobs than that by impacting the tourism and film industries irreparably.</p> <p><b>BC FILM INDUSTRY</b> The BC Film industry contributes \$1.3 billion annually to the BC economy. Crews regularly use Howe Sound to represent many world locales, as it provides the key ingredients of wilderness, breathtaking scenery, and easy access from Vancouver, and silence. The introduction of an open pit mine, gravel barge and crusher will dramatically diminish this appeal—making Vancouver itself a less convenient place to film a movie, since its nearby wilderness will no longer be viable for filming.</p> <p>In a 2012 letter to the Future of Howe Sound Society (FHSS) from Thierry Tanguy, a Unit and Location Manager, in Greater Vancouver's Film Industry, Thierry had this to say: "In the last few years, a number of projects have been filmed in the Squamish corridor, as opposed to the other regions we typically compete with, such as California and Louisiana, precisely because of the pristine beauty of its coastline. To name a specific example, I just finished working on a project entitled 'Horns' for Mandalay Pictures. ... originally slated to be filmed in Savannah, Georgia. The one element that shifted the interest in favour of British Columbia is the beauty of the Squamish corridor and Howe Sound where we ended up filming Two-Thirds of the project. This is Twenty-Million</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3406	683 - 29	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The mine will be visible from the Cypress ski area and Lions Bay, a popular hiking and rock-climbing destination. Every visitor headed to Squamish or Whistler on the Sea-to-Sky Highway and Sea-to-Sky Gondola, as well as daily sightseeing flights from downtown on Harbour Air and others, will see this once-stunning valley being rendered into a gravel mine.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3407	683 - 30	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p><b>Property Values</b> Property values along the Howe Sound have already been negatively impacted. The 16 vacation homes at McNab Creek and 53 recreational properties directly across the channel at Douglas Bay on Gambier Island will be the hardest hit due to the obvious eyesore, increased barge traffic, noise and loss of natural beauty. The reduction in property values which has already occurred since the mine was first proposed 6 years ago, harms not only residents, but municipal governments' tax base. Given the considerable increases in property values in the Lower Mainland in the last 6 years it is quite staggering that properties anywhere close to this proposed mine have seen a decline in both assessed value and potential resale value, as evidenced by recent land sales in the area.</p> <p>Vancouver-based Burrard and West Vancouver-based Thunderbird Yacht Clubs have outstations directly opposite the mine site. The 600 members will suffer loss of land value, and outstations will suffer from significantly diminished use.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
3408	683 - 31	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p><b>Social Impacts</b> Easy accessibility from Vancouver allows people across the lower mainland to enjoy wilderness on their doorstep. The impact of the mine will diminish Howe Sound for present and future generations, reducing Vancouver's much-vaunted "liveability."</p>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3409	683 - 32	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>The immediate visual impact of the mine and crushing facilities has only been shown by the proponent at sea level. To understand the full visual impact an assessment from a higher elevation is needed. We believe that from a higher elevation the open pit mine and crushing facilities will be fully visible and have a further negative social and economic impact on the properties from which they are visible.</p>	<p>The visual resources assessment (Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS) acknowledges that the residents of the McNab Strata would be most affected by the potential visual impacts due to their close proximity to the Proposed Project. The viewpoint was taken from the end of the breakwater where the view would be unobstructed, and it is a publicly accessible location that would be experienced by residents accessing the dock at the McNab Estates Strata. The lighting assessment indicated residential receptors at the Strata are located in a dark setting with existing lighting visible from adjacent industrial land use.</p> <p>Assessment of viewing locations and/or viewing conditions are limited to those locations that represent viewing opportunities that currently exist or that are certain or reasonably foreseeable.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3410	683 - 33	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In the immediate vicinity of this proposed mine there are existing communities including McNab Creek Strata, Douglas Bay Strata, Brigade Bay, Burrard Yacht Club and Thunderbird Yacht Club. All of these communities enjoy the peace and tranquillity and abundant wildlife in this amazing section of Howe Sound. Families engage in all manner of sport and recreation including hiking, swimming, water sports, sailing, wind surfing, paddle boarding and kayaking. In addition numerous kids camps such as Potlach, Day Break, Artaban, Boys and Girls Club use this area for recreation and there are frequent excursions of kayakers in procession from these camps paddling by or visiting McNab Creek area.	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3411	683 - 34	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In its draft AIR Burnco committed to reporting on the status of consultations with private local land owners and tenure holders who will be affected by the project. However Volume 4, section 21 of the report shows little evidence that Burnco fulfilled these commitments. At section 21.2.4.1 – Social Communications the list of Personal Communications lacks engagement with the local stakeholders who will be impacted by the project. For instance, although Douglas Bay is the largest private land holding in the area and will be directly impacted if the project goes ahead no one from Burnco has attempted to contact the members of the Douglas Bay Strata.	The sample of key informants described in Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS (Non-traditional Land and Resource Use) was not intended to be exhaustive of all stakeholders potentially affected by the Proposed Project, but rather was intended to be wide ranging enough to confirm and expand on non-traditional land and resource use information available from the referenced secondary sources. Key informants interviewed or provided data for this report included representatives from recreational groups and tourism operators, as well as DFO and MFLNRO. Specifically key informants included:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Burrard Yacht Club</li> <li>- Coastal Inlet Adventures</li> <li>- DFO</li> <li>- Don's Water Taxi</li> <li>- Gambier Island Local Trust</li> <li>- Gibson Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>- Islands Trust</li> <li>- MFLNRO</li> <li>- Recreation Sites and Trails BC</li> <li>- Sewell's Marina</li> <li>- Squamish Yacht Club</li> <li>- Sunshine Kayaks</li> <li>- Thunderbird Yacht Club</li> </ul> Conditions C-5.1 through C-5.3 (Table 19.1) outlines the Proponent commitment to ongoing engagement with the McNab Creek Strata. BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. BURNCO has also proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3412	683 - 35	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	In conclusion we cannot see how the joint goals of environmental, social and economic sustainability for Howe Sound can be achieved if this project is allowed to go ahead. We can only trust in the process and believe that our public servants and government will recognize that the value of McNab Creek and the whole Howe Sound region outweighs the business needs of one Alberta based company.	BURNCO will support sustainable development by designing, constructing, operating and reclaiming the proposed Project in accordance with practices that reflect environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. The Sustainable Development Framework for the proposed Project is presented in Section 2.5.4.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.
3413	683 - 36	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	If the project should go ahead we need to ensure that there are stringent conditions (including multi-million dollar environmental bonds) attached to its approval which are closely monitored on an ongoing basis by an independent third party and to ensure that the scope of the operation does not extend beyond that described in the EIS. A robust monitoring and safeguard system needs to be in place to ensure the commitments in this application are followed through and that Burnco is held accountable should the need arise.	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3414	683 - 37	Jeff and Sarra Gau	Not Stated	<p>Finally we suggest that Burnco is required to grant restrictive covenants in favour of the landowners surrounding the proposed project to ensure that the commitments and assurances given in the approval process are effectively monitored and enforced.</p>	<p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 and are summarized below. BURNCO commits to funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring.</p> <p>Compliance monitoring will occur during all phases of Proposed Project activities as a part of the Proposed Project construction and operational Environmental Protection Plans (EPPS). Compliance monitoring will include assessment of Proponent and contractors' environmental performance using specifically developed performance indicators and benchmarks. Where possible, an adaptive management approach will be used to modify management plans as needed based on the results of the monitoring program.</p> <p>BURNCO will submit a report to the BCEAO on the status of compliance with the Certificate Conditions, at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Construction;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Construction;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Operations;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Operations;</li> <li>- At least 30 days prior to the start of Closure and Reclamation;</li> <li>- On or before January 31 in each year after the start of Closure and Reclamation; and</li> <li>- Within 30 days of completing Closure and Reclamation.</li> </ul> <p>Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3415	684 - 1	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	<p>I was going to say something but this says it all...I would only start cursing and using expletives about what stupid people do to their world all for the sake of a few bucks and short term gain. Why can't you just go some place else...I think it starts with "H". Seriously though, give your heads a shake and think about what a world you are going to leave to your grandchildren? Do we really need another gravel pit destroying our natural world. I just get so terribly depressed when people like you are allowed to reign over my world. What is the point of living in a world with so many ugly people who just want to make everything ugly for a lousy dirty dollar? Why...indeed read why you should not.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3416	684 - 2	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	1. Why would anyone develop a gravel mine in Vancouver's ocean playground, an area of outstanding natural beauty? This is where an ever growing city comes to sail, dive, kayak, fish, camp and hike. Tourists flock from all over the world to see "SuperNatural, British Columbia", how would a gravel pit look in the tourism advertising?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3417	684 - 3	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>It is acknowledged that historical industrial activities have impacted Howe Sound and that the ecological health of the area has been improving. The current state of Howe Sound is reflected in the baseline conditions against which potential effects were assessed. Baseline/existing conditions environment are summarized within each technical section of the EAC Application/EIS (5.1 through 9.2).</p> <p>Baseline reports are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3418	684 - 4	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	2. Howe Sound is only now showing encouraging signs of environmental recovery after decades of industrial misuse. Should we now allow a reindustrialization of the area?	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3419	684 - 5	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3420	684 - 6	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	3. How can we consider developing a massive 77 hectare pit which will excavate the entire McNab estuary from one side of the valley to the other, completely eliminating one of only three river estuaries in Howe Sound, without developing an integrated, long term land and water use plan for the whole of Howe Sound?	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3421	684 - 7	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	4. The size of the gravel pit will limit access to the foreshore for wildlife such as elk, deer and bears who currently frequent the area to forage for food.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
3422	684 - 8	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	5. The excavation of the river estuary will dramatically change the movement of water through the valley and have a significant negative impact on the freshwater habitat.	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.  Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3423	684 - 9	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	6. The proposed mine developer, Burnco, filed a judicial review application against DFO in BC Supreme Court to 'strong arm' the DFO to allow them to proceed to an environmental review. The DFO have since agreed to that review with serious concerns as "the project presents a high risk to Salmon and Salmon habitat".	Documentation of government agency consultation is provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 3 of the EAC Application/EIS. Key issues raised by government agencies and First Nations are presented and the nature and extent of their involvement is described, including participation on the Technical Working Group established to review the Proposed Project. A summary of the federal EA review, including DFO's involvement is specifically addressed and responses to concerns related to potential effect effects on fish and fish habitat are provided.  Detailed issues tracking tables are provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 2-A (Technical Working Group), Appendix 2-B (Aboriginal), and Appendix 2-C (Public) of the EAC Application/EIS.
3424	684 - 10	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	7. In addition to the destruction to fish habitat, Burnco's own consultants believe the mine site could be home to 21 species at risk including a population of Roosevelt Elk re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.	A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components: - Amphibian species at risk - Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet; - Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear; - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems; - Ecosystems at risk; and - Plant species a risk.  Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.  Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.
3425	684 - 11	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible. The SCR noise bylaw was considered as part of the assessment.
3426	684 - 12	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	8. The noise from the gravel crushing facility and loading of barges will be significant. It will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by boaters, kayakers, fishermen, tourists and other in Howe Sound. The mine developer has stated at meetings that if the demand is there, they want to run the mining and crushing facilities 24/7, 365 days a year.	The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCR noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.  Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3427	684 - 13	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3428	684 - 14	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	<p>9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.</p>	<p>A predictive noise model was developed for the Proposed Project as described in Volume 2, Section 9.2. The Type 7810 Predictor® (Predictor®) software was used to assess the potential noise effects associated with the Proposed Project as well as the effectiveness of potential noise controls.</p> <p>Effects to wildlife related to noise were estimated by overlaying the output of noise models with species-specific habitat suitability mapping and summarizing the change in habitat for VCs for which noise thresholds were defined in literature (i.e., amphibian species at risk, northern goshawk, western screech-owl, marbled murrelet, and common nighthawk). Noise thresholds beyond which habitat loss is expected are defined for each VC in Section 5.3.1.5.2 of Vol 2, Section 5.3.</p> <p>Due to the paucity of literature regarding noise thresholds for Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear, effects of noise and other sensory disturbance were measured using published zones of influence (ZOI). A ZOI represents the distance at which avoidance of certain anthropogenic disturbances has been observed.</p> <p>Noise will be managed during the construction and operational phases according to the Environmental Objectives and Best Management Practices for Aggregate Extraction in BC (BC MWLAP 2002). Noise mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 9.2 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining vegetation and trees around the active work areas to act as a noise buffer;</li> <li>- Reducing the height aggregate falls along conveyors and within the crushing facility;</li> <li>- Enclosing conveyors which will assist in reducing noise emissions;</li> <li>- Minimizing speed on roadways;</li> <li>- Operating equipment within specifications and maintaining level roads; and</li> <li>- Reducing idling time.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3429	684 - 15	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	9. Noise and light pollution will have significant negative impacts on the land and aquatic animals in the area. Noise and vibration pollution have been found to negatively impact the ability of marine mammals to communicate, navigate, find food and it is believed increasingly to impact their fertility.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3430	684 - 16	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	10. The mine will have an impact on the economic potential of the Howe Sound area. There is considerable potential in Howe Sound to continue to grow the tourism industry with significant economic multipliers that would accrue to the local economy. A mine is not going to add to the beauty of the area.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3431	684 - 17	Sheera von Puttkamer	Not Stated	How can you help? Howe Sound needs to be protected for the enjoyment of both current and future generations so we are asking you to be an ambassador for Howe Sound in telling the government that you support the recovery of Howe Sound.	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3432	685 - 1	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	I am writing in opposition to the Burnco Mine Project on the basis that it will cause harm to McNab Creek and the McNab Creek estuary which cannot be mitigated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3433	685 - 2	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	I am writing in opposition to the Burnco Mine Project on the basis that it will cause harm to McNab Creek and the McNab Creek estuary which cannot be mitigated.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3434	685 - 3	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	<p>There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.</p>	<p>The proposed Project has undergone a rigorous assessment that has considered a broad range of potential environmental, socio-economic, heritage and health effects. A cooperative federal-provincial technical review of the Application is currently underway.</p> <p>Additional details regarding the BCEAO environmental assessment review process is provided in Volume 1, Part A –Section 3.1.2. of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3435	685 - 4	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	<p>There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3436	685 - 5	Lynn Chapman	Roberts Creek, BC	There is no justification, save private interest by the proponents, for re-industrializing Howe Sound now that it is finally returning to life sustaining capacity. I am not a biologist or an expert but I have seen the biodiversity that the estuary currently supports and I also know there are only two such estuaries in Howe Sound. if that rare and fragile ecosystem is destroyed it will harm the recovery of the whole of Howe Sound. That is not in the Public's interest. The new science around the excavation and removal of vast amounts of sand and gravel needs to be reviewed and considered. Unfortunately, the lack of quality, depth and breadth of focus of the current Environmental Assessment process cannot be trusted to actually protect biodiversity and ecosystem integrity over the short term interests of business. Notwithstanding that I urge you sincerely to protect McNab Creek, its estuary and the recovering lands above it and to reject the Burnco Application.	BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.  BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.
3437	686 - 1	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	Please find attached our comments for you consideration under the public comment period relating to the proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine EIS.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3438	686 - 2	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<p>BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project – 54754 Comments Relating to Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Context for Comments: Howe Sound is undergoing an ecological renaissance following decades of pollution by industrial operations. Clean up costs relating to the Britannia mine operations required an investment of over \$75 million of which only \$30 million was contributed by the mine's former operators. To date, the province has spent in excess of \$46 million on remediation at Britannia. The investment of public monies at this scale, to restore Howe Sound, has led to a subsequent boom in eco-tourism activities. This means industrial proposals such as the BURNCO Aggregate Mine not only risk impacting the marine and terrestrial environments around the Sound but also directly conflict with eco-tourism and recreation activities for which the area has become known.</p> <p>Comments On The Proposal: The following points highlight our primary concerns relating to the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal estimates removal of 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel, with pit depths of up to 15 metres across an area of 30 hectares, over a period of 16 years. In addition to aggregate pits the site will house auxiliary sorting, crushing, cleaning, transportation, administration and supporting facilities. The entire site will be based in 70 hectares.</li> </ul>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3439	686 - 3	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal is based around the extraction of a non-renewable resource. This resource is being used for building materials, such as concrete, which have high energy and ghg footprints and are non-sustainable.</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3440	686 - 4	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<p><b>Biodiversity &amp; Habitat:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proponent's consultants highlight over 20 'Species at Risk' that will be impacted by the mine. We do not believe this is acceptable as this high density of 'Species at Risk' indicates the diversity of the habitat provided at McNab Creek.</li> <li>- For many terrestrial species the EIS highlights that the habitat loss, barriers to movement and change in mortality resulting from the mine will persist through the construction, operations and the reclamation and closure phases.</li> <li>- As McNab Creek currently hosts bald eagles, Roosevelt Elk, and an estuary flourishing with marine life, the proposal will irrevocably impact the biodiversity of the project area.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3441	686 - 5	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As McNab Creek currently hosts bald eagles, Roosevelt Elk, and an estuary flourishing with marine life, the proposal will irrevocably impact the biodiversity of the project area.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3442	686 - 6	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have concerns regarding the mines effect on marine diversity, fish and the recovering Howe Sound, especially with regards to fish and fish habitat, particularly chum and coho salmon, and echo concerns previously expressed by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3443	686 - 7	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional concerns relate to vibrations from the site (during all phases), which will impact key species such as herring and interfere with marine mammals' navigation, food finding, and reproductive systems—effectively alienating orcas and dolphins from habitat they have only recently returned too.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges.</p> <p>Overviews on hearing sensitivity and noise thresholds for marine fish and marine mammals are presented in Sections 5.2.5.2.3.1.3 and 5.2.5.2.4.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish and marine mammals, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3444	686 - 8	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proponent makes no effort to consider the cumulative impacts of their project in relation to others, such as the ongoing logging in the McNab Valley and upstream Run of River power projects, all of which combined increase impacts exponentially.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>
3445	686 - 9	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of the mine sets a precedent that may allow for continued operations or expanded scale in the future, outside that currently considered in the EIS.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project is to extract approximately 20 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the 16 year life of the Proposed Project. This will be reflected in an approved EA certificate and mine plan.</p>
3446	686 - 10	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<p>Societal &amp; Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Howe Sound is becoming a key recreation asset in the Sea-to-Sky corridor, resulting in investment in new infrastructure such as the Sea-to-Sky Gondola and the recently opened Marine Trail. As people come to see and experience nature, the visual and acoustic impacts of an industrial development of this type are in direct conflict with the peace and quiet for which the McNab Creek area is valued.</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3447	686 - 11	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Estuary and intact wetlands in the Howe Sound watershed provide taxpayers with an estimated saving of up to \$22 million per year through embedded ecosystem services such as flood protection, air purification and water filtration. Loss of the McNab Creek area should be expected to reduce these values.</li> </ul>	<p>BURNCO understands this concern for Howe Sound and is a proud steward of the Proposed Project site and surrounding area.</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Project through design features, best management practices and other measures described in Volume 3, Part G - Section 18. The EAC Application/EIS provides technically and economically feasible mitigation measures which first avoid and second reduce potential adverse effects for all VCs. VCs were assessed across all phases of the Proposed Project lifecycle (construction, operations, reclamation and closure), including Proposed Project activities, accidents and malfunctions and cumulative effects. The conclusion of the assessment is that, with the application of design considerations and identified mitigation, no significant adverse effects will result from the Proposed Project.</p>
3448	686 - 12	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning of the proposed mine site from current rural RU-2 to 'industrial use' would continue a precedent that places private profit over community values, opportunity cost born by businesses and residents of the S2S and the deterioration of shared natural assets.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Project lies within Electoral Area F of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. While there are three OCPs in Electoral Area F, none of them overlap with the local study area (LSA). Regional zoning for the LSA is discussed in Volume 2, Part B, Section 6 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3449	686 - 13	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal seems to come at little, to no, benefit to the local community. Industrial activity will be an eyesore, machinery noise will disturb quality of life and reduce property values. With only 12 permanent jobs created at the proposed mine, the loss of direct and indirect jobs in other sectors of the economy could easily exceed jobs created at the mine.</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding Proposed Project benefits are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2.10 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Benefits of the Proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capital expenditures (\$21.5 million),</li> <li>- operational expenditures (\$13 million/year),</li> <li>- direct, indirect and induced employment, and</li> <li>- taxation revenue.</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the uses of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers. The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p> <p>BURNCO will enhance local economic benefits by implementing policies and practices to support local hiring and procurement when possible.</p> <p>Other benefits or positive effects of the Proposed Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased baseflows, wetted area and average flow depth in McNab Creek and several of the other watercourses;</li> <li>- Increased wetted are in the lower segment of WC2 through the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel;</li> <li>- New amphibian breeding habitat ;</li> <li>- Improved aesthetic qualities of the Property after closure would likely have a positive effect on nearby property use and value, and positive social and recreational effects.</li> </ul>
3450	686 - 14	Association of Whistler Area Residents for the Environment	Whistler, BC	Due to the above concerns, our review of the BURNCO Aggregate Mine EIS leads us to believe the proposal presents too great a long-term risk, when evaluated against multiple values, to warrant approval.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3451	687 - 1	Tracey Saxby	Squamish, BC	<p>RE: Key concerns regarding BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project, proposed at McNab Creek in Howe Sound. While I have had very limited time to adequately review this proposal within the short timeframe permitted by the BC EAO/CEAA, I have outlined a few of my key concerns follows:</p>	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3452	687 - 2	Tracey Saxby	Squamish, BC	<p>1) Estuaries are an irreplaceable natural resource.</p> <p>Estuaries deliver invaluable ecosystem services, as well as providing economic, cultural, and ecological benefits to communities.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands are one of the ecosystems most threatened by development, however they trap (sequester) more carbon than rainforests. Both seagrasses and salt marsh grasses are incredibly productive carbon sinks, as the carbon they use to make their leaves are incorporated into the layers of sediment every year. Estuaries worldwide sequester up to 100 teragrams of carbon per year. Saltmarshes sequester up to 24 tonnes of carbon per hectare per year.</p> <p>Estuaries and wetlands also help to make our water cleaner, as they act like a giant liver that filters and traps pollutants such as herbicides, pesticides, and heavy metals, as well as sediments and nutrients. They are hotspots for biodiversity, and are vital as habitat for migrating birds, and nurseries for juvenile fish. They stabilize shorelines, minimize erosion, and protect coastal areas from floods and storm surges, acting like a sponge and soaking up the excess floodwater.</p> <p>Vegetated coastal habitats such as seagrasses and saltmarsh habitat rank amongst the most threatened marine ecosystems. About 25% of the area originally covered by salt-marshes has been globally lost due to development, with current loss rates at about 1 to 2% per</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3453	687 - 3	Tracey Saxby	Squamish, BC	<p>McNab Creek is the second-largest estuary in Howe Sound, one of only three estuaries located in this southern-most fjord. It deserves to be protected.</p> <p>QUESTIONS: Given the proximity of alternative, undeveloped gravel resources, why should this gravel mine be permitted in such a vitally important and sensitive ecosystem? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of the invaluable ecosystem services outlined above? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of the McNab Creek estuary as a carbon sink?</p> <p>SOURCES:</p> <p>Bridgham, S.D., J.P. Magonigal, J.K. Keller, N.B. Bliss, and C. Trettin. 2006. The carbon balance of North American wetlands. <i>Wetlands</i> 26: 889–916.</p> <p>Cebrian, J. and C. M. Duarte. 1996. Plant growth-rate dependence of detrital carbon storage in ecosystems. <i>Science</i> 268: 1606-1608.</p> <p>Duarte, C.M., W.C. Dennison, R.J.W. Orth and T.J.B. Carruthers. 2008. The charisma of coastal ecosystems: addressing the imbalance"- <i>Estuaries and Coasts</i> 31:233–238.</p> <p>Duarte, C.M., M. Holmer, Y. Olsen, D. Soto, N. Marbà, J. Guiu, K. Black and I. Karakassis. 2009. Will the Oceans Help Feed Humanity?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>An estuary is a semi-enclosed body of sea water where salinity is measurably diluted by freshwater from a stream or river. It is where the fresh water meets the salt water. They are often characterized as having low salinities, shallow depths, high turbidity, high levels of nutrients, and high productivity.</p> <p>The McNab Creek estuary overlaps with the proposed marine infrastructure (ie. the electric conveyor) and a portion of the proposed shipping routes, but the Project will have no effect on the estuary. We will not be mining within the estuary.</p> <p>The other considerations assessed in regards to the estuary are changes to the amount of freshwater dilution from watercourses in the proposed Project area. Based on surface water models, the water courses at the proposed Project site will contribute similar combined freshwater flow outputs as currently exist. This will result in no change in the amount of freshwater output into the estuary and no predicted change to the extent of the McNab Creek estuary. The estuary will be unchanged by the Project.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3454	687 - 4	Tracey Saxby	Squamish, BC	<p>2) Loss of channel complexity and sediment replenishment</p> <p>The proponent proposes to build a dike along the northern and eastern edge of the gravel extraction area which will permanently restrict the flow of McNab Creek. While it appears that the current channel hasn't changed in quite some time, the restriction of creeks/rivers limits channel complexity by restricting the powerful currents that would typically shape the watercourse and surrounding floodplain. These changes to how creeks/rivers flow results in the loss of the complex network of side channels, sloughs, alcoves, ponds, and wetlands, as well as a loss of floodplain forest. These diverse and dynamic habitats are very important for salmon, beavers, river otters, and birds, and other fauna.</p> <p>These dikes will isolate McNab Creek from its natural fan delta, restricting sediment replenishment in the western part of the estuary. This in turn will likely increase the risk of erosion of the shoreline and tidal flat, resulting in loss of diverse habitats.</p> <p>Water flowing beneath creeks/rivers periodically resurfaces to create coldwater refuges for temperature-sensitive fish like salmon and trout. These coldwater refuges are vital, especially given the current and future impacts of climate change on these iconic west-coast species.</p> <p>Question 3.1: What mitigation is proposed to offset the loss of natural river-mouth migration, and the loss of sediment deposition</p>	<p>An assessment of avulsion risk on McNab Creek indicated that, on short time scales (decadal) the risk of lateral channel migration of McNab Creek into the area of the proposed project is considered to be Low. Appropriate engineering of the flood control dyke can reduce the risk to Very Low. Long term maintenance will be required to sustain the Very Low risk level.</p> <p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m2 of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. No other fisheries-related offset is proposed.</p>
3455	687 - 5	Tracey Saxby	Squamish, BC	<p>QUESTIONS: How will the proponent offset the loss of sediment deposition on the western part of the estuary? How does the proponent propose to adequately compensate for the loss of channel complexity and diverse habitats vital to salmon and other species as outlined above?</p> <p>SOURCES:</p> <p>Hulse, D. &amp; Gregory, S. (2004) Integrating resilience into floodplain restoration. Urban Ecosystems 7: 295.</p>	<p>The biological function of the estuary is influenced by the sediment supply currently entering the estuary from McNab Creek which is derived from actively eroding locations within the watershed. The extraction of terrestrial gravel deposits from the pit is not expected to impact or change the function of the estuary because the alluvial fan is not a contributor to the sediment/gravel budget.</p> <p>Assessing the accuracy of the assessment predictions and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be done through an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program (EEMP) that will include consistent monitoring before, during and after activities that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Where practical the design of the EEMP will include the use of reference sites unlikely to be impacted by the Project as a means of distinguishing natural variation from Project caused effects</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3456	688 - 1	Vel Anderson	Not Stated	<p>We are in the Cascadia subduction earthquake zone, scientists find there is an 85% chance of a major earthquake, BC Government states there is a 1 in 3 chance that a major earthquake will happen within the next 50 years.</p> <p>The idea of a berm, built partially of the silt removed from washing of the gravel, along a portion of McNab Creek to the North, and a similar berm, built along the South section of the man made lake will face liquefaction and flooding in a major earthquake.</p> <p>There is a very serious concern about the whole estuary being wiped out should a mega earthquake hit. The man made berms will liquefy and flood across the estuary. This will smother all the small and very small marine life forms. We will see an adverse impact on species in the Sound for many years, as without the nutrient of the smaller marine life, the next level of fish will not survive.</p> <p>Has a recent geological engineering seismic study been done on the area?</p> <p>Has high energy seismic surveys in Federal waters been carried out recently?</p> <p>Do you have a seismic mediation strategy report or study?</p> <p>Will an earthquake warning device be placed at the project, if not, why?</p> <p>When the entire zone gives way at once, an event that seismologists call a full-margin rupture, the magnitude will be somewhere between 8.7 and 9.2. (<a href="http://www.inquisitr.com/2255422/cascadia-fault-line-earthquake-prediction-for-californiaoregon-claims-a-megaquake-tsunami/#LFO6y7WPuzAtLDt1.99">http://www.inquisitr.com/2255422/cascadia-fault-line-earthquake-prediction-for-californiaoregon-claims-a-megaquake-tsunami/#LFO6y7WPuzAtLDt1.99</a>)</p> <p>"Great Subduction Zone earthquakes are the largest earthquakes in</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project. The potential for damage or loss of proposed on-shore and marine facilities associated with the earthquake-related ground shaking, soil liquefaction-induced loss of strength and foundation support, lateral spreading movements and potential ground surface ruptures from faulting at depth have been considered in Volume 3, Part D, Section 14 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects of earthquakes on the project consider seismic events that might occur throughout the region including local events. Existing earthquake data are used to assess seismic hazard, including potential earthquakes associated with the Cascadia Subduction zone.</p> <p>The pit lake containment berm will be designed and built to appropriate design criteria, which include seismic stability considerations.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3457	689 - 1	Vel Anderson	Not Stated	<p>The following from Golder Associates to Burnco Aggregate Project. Why was this report relying on old information from 2005 and beyond? The geological hazards in the McNab area are significant as this report shows. An "assessment comprising a desktop review of existing information" is not acceptable, especially knowing the fact that this project is in the Cascadia Subduction earthquake zone. (5.4.4 Baseline Conditions) "The natural hazards baseline conditions was completed by conducting a terrain and terrain stability mapping assessment comprising a desktop review of existing information, production of a terrain base map, and analysis of the potential for the terrain hazards to affect the Proposed Project facilities". (5.4.4.5 Discussion) "avalanching and steep valley sidewall debris and rock slides are common in the McNab Creek watershed, they are not expected to directly affect the LSA. Activities associated with the Proposed Project Area are not anticipated to increase the potential for initiating mass wasting (i.e., landslide) events. How was this determined?</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential geotechnical and natural hazard effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The objectives of this assessment were to identify and evaluate static and seismic ground conditions, and potential landslide, debris flow/flood and avalanche hazards that could be impacted by the Proposed Project, or that could impact the Proposed Project.</p> <p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p>
3458	689 - 2	Vel Anderson	Not Stated	<p>Landslides and snow avalanches can transport debris and sediment to creeks, increase water volumes, increase fine sediment transport, and in some cases debris jams can cause outburst floods (as seen with debris flood events). Evidence for significant debris flows and debris floods (including outburst floods) was not identified in this desktop assessment".</p> <p>Current geological data would be critical for making sound sensible decisions on outcomes for this area.</p> <p>At the end of production, a huge water filled pit remains, with man made silt berms to the North and one to the South, just one good avalanche, or an extreme winter rainstorm could push through the berm and take out the whole pit. This would ruin the McNab estuary for many years. Could we experience another Mount Polley? or a failed Bafokeng Dam? "The report, which was released on Friday morning in Victoria, said the design failed to take into account the complexity of the instability of underlying glacial and pre-glacial layers under the retaining wall". This is a project that could become a huge environmental disaster, something we do not need!</p>	<p>A terrain stability field assessment was completed on November 2-3, 2016. The results of the field assessment, together with the data in our existing hydrologic and geotechnical assessment reports (Hydrological and Hydraulic Characterization McNab Valley Aggregate Project Howe Sound BC, Concrete Aggregate Summary, Assessment of Avulsion Risk of McNab Creek (located in EA Vol. 4 Appendix 5.4 – C, F, A respectively) indicate that there is no evidence for historic debris flows or debris floods. Therefore, further investigations are not considered to be required.</p> <p>Based on a conservative assessment using the existing geotechnical data from subsurface investigations previously carried out, the risk of significant and extensive liquefaction in the Project area is considered to be low to very low, and likely only to be associated with a large earthquake (i.e. 1 in 2,475 year event). Therefore, supplementary geotechnical investigations and analyses are not considered to be required.</p> <p>The Flood Protection Dyke and Pit Lake Containment Berm will be designed and built to appropriate design criteria, which include seismic stability considerations.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3459	690 - 1	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	We purchased a cabin at McNab Creek Estates in 1998 with the intent of retiring there. We have had 18 years of family and friend quality times weekends and vacation periods there though out the years. Our children, grand-children and all others have thrived on the McNab Creek life style, such as the wildlife, sea life, birdlife, ever-changing views, community and recreation etc. Having been there first we have concerns about the Burnco gravel mine proposal:	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3460	690 - 2	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	1. How will the very popular beach dunes where swimming for the local communities be affected?	A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.  The Proposed Project will not interfere with the used of the beach dunes adjacent to McNab Creek. Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.
3461	690 - 3	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	2. Will Lot 1, strata properties and McNab strata common properties be exposed to greater erosion from McNab Creek?	A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.  Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Any change will move McNab Creek flows closer to what would have been experienced prior to the installation of the existing constructed groundwater channel. No increase in erosion from McNab Creek is anticipated.
3462	690 - 4	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	3. Machinery noise, vibrations, dust, lighting, visuals, safety & accidental pollution are all concerns that we have....	A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.  Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.  A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3463	690 - 5	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	3. Machinery noise, vibrations, dust, lighting, visuals, safety & accidental pollution are all concerns that we have....	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3464	690 - 6	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	3. Machinery noise, vibrations, dust, lighting, visuals, safety & accidental pollution are all concerns that we have....	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3465	690 - 7	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	Until we have confirmation of how these things will be handled, we are against the proposal.	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3466	690 - 8	Dennis and Barb MacPherson	McNab Creek, BC	Until we have confirmation of how these things will be handled, we are against the proposal.	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>
3467	691 - 1	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	Please see the following concerns - attached.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3468	691 - 2	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	In addition, there is a need for a thorough cumulative assessment of proposed industry in Howe Sound on the following 4 subjects:	<p>Potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and other certain and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities have been assessed for all non-negligible residual effects (i.e., for all potential effects of the Proposed Project determined to be significant or not significant following the application of proposed mitigation) in accordance with an assessment methodology that reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The significance of potential cumulative residual effects was characterized for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine mammals – behavioural disturbance</li> <li>- Amphibian species at risk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk – barriers to movement, change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Grizzly bear – change in mortality, habitat loss</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems – loss of extent</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk – loss of extent</li> <li>- Air quality indicators – increase in PM2.5 (24 hr, annual), PM10 (24 hr), TSP (24 hr, annual)</li> <li>- Real estate – change in real estate value</li> <li>- Marine navigation – interference with navigation use and navigability due to Project-related vessel traffic</li> <li>- Harvesting fish and wildlife – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Recreation and tourism – change in environmental setting</li> <li>- Visual quality – change in visual quality</li> <li>- Heritage resources – changes to heritage resource integrity, context and accessibility</li> <li>- People – Human health (air quality and particulate matter).</li> </ul> <p>All potential cumulative residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant except net effects to grizzly bear; cumulative residual effects to the threatened Squamish-Lillooet Grizzly Bear Population Unit were determined to be significant due in large part to vehicle collisions that might result from the development of new logging roads. Grizzly bear have not been observed within the Proposed Project area and the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3469	691 - 3	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>1. Socio-economic impacts: The application for Burnco seems to think that in terms of socio-economic impacts, Burnco is too far from Woodfibre LNG to have any interaction. However, both facilities are in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor, and are all part of Howe Sound. The many tourists travelling to Whistler experience the Sound as a contiguous area that has a positive transition from over-industrialization (Vancouver) back to natural beauty. Many new business and residents have arrived precisely because of this natural beauty. A return of multiple significant industrial projects on Howe Sound should be evaluated for cumulative impacts, especially on tourism, and the region's natural brand. An assessment that fails to recognize that all development on the Sound impacts the whole Sound is seriously flawed. The assessment also makes absolutely no mention of the new compressor station (run on natural gas) planned for Mt. Mulligan, which is again further re-industrialization of the area. Any significant shift in economic basis will have impacts, but these have not been addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential recreation and tourism effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Measures proposed to address key nuisance concerns (noise, air quality, visual quality) also mitigate potential effects on the quality of the environmental setting. Recreation and tourism activities are not expected to be displaced and potential residual effects will be limited to the life of the Proposed Project and were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3470	691 - 4	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>An assessment that fails to recognize that all development on the Sound impacts the whole Sound is seriously flawed. The assessment also makes absolutely no mention of the new compressor station (run on natural gas) planned for Mt. Mulligan, which is again further re-industrialization of the area. Any significant shift in economic basis will have impacts, but these have not been addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> <p>As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.</p>
3471	691 - 5	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>2. Health of the ocean: The application does not seem to address the approved Woodfibre LNG cooling system. Cetaceans and fish alike travel the whole Sound. Although these facilities may have distance between them, they represent a growing collection of stresses on fish and other wildlife that travel the whole Sound. The cumulative stress needs to be addressed. We're not dealing with goldfish that stay confined to a little bowl.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will be mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3472	691 - 6	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>3. Air quality: The geography of the Sound makes it a funnel for pollution, and even today we see a concentration of pollution from the Lower Mainland funnel up through Squamish on some Summer days. The cumulative impacts assessment fails to take the impacts on Squamish from the Burnco operations. It also fails to address the additional impacts from the proposed Mt. Mulligan compressor, and Mt. Garibaldi. Mt. Garibaldi will result in a significant addition to regional traffic (pollution) and thus Howe Sound pollution. An air quality assessment needs to consider how pollutants travel in the Sound, and the cumulative impacts of all major projects.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3473	691 - 7	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>4. Light pollution at night: If Woodfibre LNG and Burnco are both built, safety lights will be on at night - both at the industrial plant and on the docks - for Woodfibre LNG, Burnco, and Howe Sound Pulp &amp; Paper. This will have a big effect on dark night skies in Howe Sound. This will reduce the pleasure many take in Howe Sound. The cumulative effect of these 3 industries on night light pollution in Howe Sound needs to be analyzed. All 4 points above need to be analyzed and quantified, and presented to the public before further decisions are made.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3474	691 - 8	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08__Full_Report__Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3475	691 - 9	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3476	691 - 10	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3477	691 - 11	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3478	691 - 12	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
3479	691 - 13	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCR D said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3480	691 - 14	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
3481	691 - 15	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3482	691 - 16	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
3483	691 - 17	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3484	691 - 18	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
3485	691 - 19	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3486	691 - 20	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3487	691 - 21	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3488	691 - 22	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3489	691 - 23	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3490	691 - 24	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
3491	691 - 25	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
3492	691 - 26	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3493	691 - 27	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
3494	691 - 28	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
3495	691 - 29	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3496	691 - 30	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
3497	691 - 31	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide this assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3498	691 - 32	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
3499	691 - 33	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3500	691 - 34	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
3501	691 - 35	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3502	691 - 36	Laurie Parkinson	Bowyer Island, BC	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3503	692 - 1	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	I am authorized to submit the attached comments in regard to this proposed project.	Your position is understood and will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3504	692 - 2	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 1: Regional demand for additional aggregate is not demonstrated</p> <p>The Vancouver market requirement for an additional gravel /aggregate source is not supported by the proponent's documentation. A greater profit margin for the Proponent should not be grounds for destroying the estuary of McNab Creek.</p> <p>Recommendation: A supply/demand report showing strong evidence of the need for supply from this location (and the unavailability of supply from established locations), such as has been done for the Okanagan region, should be prepared before considering a permit for this project. See <a href="https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf">https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/112368/2013_11_08_Full_Report_Aggregate_Supply_and_Demand_Update_and_Analysis.pdf</a></p>	<p>The purpose underlying the Proposed Project is outlined in Section 2.2 of the EAC Application/EIS. Aggregate is a non-renewable resource. Once land is developed, access to underlying aggregate is forever lost on that site. If an aggregate resources is not developed locally, aggregate materials will have to be hauled from another site - one that could be many more kilometres away and require the use of trucks. The further a community needs to travel to find sources of aggregates for all types of construction, the more expensive the aggregate becomes to local consumers.</p> <p>Gravel from the Proposed Project will be used to supply gravel to Lower Mainland located processing plants owned and operated by the proponent. These facilities are currently supplied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Polaris Material Corp.'s Orca Quarry at Port McNeil located on northern Vancouver Island, BC;</li> <li>- Jack Cewe Ltd.'s Treat Creek Operations located in Jervis Inlet, BC; and</li> <li>- Construction Aggregates Ltd.'s gravel mine located in Sechelt, BC.</li> </ul> <p>The development of the Project would result a reduction in barge tow distance of up to 280 km between current aggregate sources and processing facilities, thereby improving the environmental impacts.</p>
3505	692 - 3	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 2: Loss of productive salmon habitat</p> <p>The project has (twice) been rejected by Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada because of the likely loss of salmon habitat in McNab Creek. In a year of disastrous returns to the Fraser and other runs, this proposal is ill-timed and ill-advised.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential fisheries, freshwater habitat and marine resource effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.1 (Fisheries and Freshwater Resources) and 5.2 (Marine Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quantity of quality of fish habitat. The loss of riparian and in-stream habitat will be offset by the construction of a new 790m groundwater-fed channel which will provide increased habitat for anadromous salmonids and resident Cutthroat Trout.</p> <p>The Proposed Project will not lead to a reduction in the quality of marine habitat. Any loss of marine habitat will be offset and potential effects on marine resources will mitigated through the planning and implementation of known and effective measures and practices. All potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3506	692 - 4	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 3: Insufficient data for at-risk species baselines.</p> <p>For several key aquatic and land-based species (such as anadromous salmon, resident cutthroat trout and Roosevelt elk), population data was collected over far too narrow a timespan to be useful for establishing accurate baselines. Without accurate baselines, quantitative monitoring of the effects of this project will not be possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Part-year data is utterly insufficient to establishing accurate baselines. At least five years of data should be collected to afford accurate baselines usable for ongoing monitoring of effects on species populations and habitat. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where habitat damage exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The Assessment Methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. The baseline studies conducted are sufficient for the purpose of assessing potential effects of the Proposed Project on selected Valued Components. Additional years of supplemental field studies are not required or proposed for the assessment.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS. Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with EA certificate conditions and with conditions of all required permits and approvals. Effects monitoring will include periodic sampling or studies on/of groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, fish, air quality, surface water and aquatic health. The studies will be conducted with a Proposed Project study area (receiving environment) and a reference area. Monitoring plans will establish timelines and schedule for each monitoring activity (e.g., give years for post-construction monitoring). Monitoring data will be assessed against Proposed Project-specific guidelines which will be developed based on Canadian and BC guidelines and baseline benchmarks.</p>
3507	692 - 5	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 4: 21 species officially at risk from Burnco.</p> <p>Burnco's consultants documented that the gravel quarry could be home to 21 species officially at risk. This includes Roosevelt elk , re-introduced to McNab Creek in 2001 by the BC Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Precautionary Principle, properly applied, should see this proposal firmly rejected.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential wildlife and vegetation effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects were assessed for the following selected valued components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amphibian species at risk</li> <li>- Western screech owl, Common nighthawk, Northern goshawk Band-tailed pigeon and Marbled murrelet;</li> <li>- Roosevelt elk and grizzly bear;</li> <li>- Environmentally sensitive ecosystems;</li> <li>- Ecosystems at risk; and</li> <li>- Plant species a risk.</li> </ul> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., design features and operational requirements, environmental management planning, habitat enhancement, progressive reclamation, etc.), potential residual effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on grizzly bear were determined to be significant however the Proposed Project is not predicted to contribute to the potential mortality of the species.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3508	692 - 6	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 5: Will McNab Creek and the estuary become salty?</p> <p>As rock is removed from the mine, fresh water from the estuary will creep into the resultant 25m pit. This will lead to salt water seeping into the estuary, and into McNab Creek. This will kill a variety of salmon and plants.</p> <p>Recommendation: Have thorough hydrological studies done over several years. Use the precautionary principle. Local authorities (eg. SCR D) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where salination exceeds preagreed norms.</p>	<p>The hydraulic conductivity of the valley sediments is much higher than hydraulic conductivity of any bedrock structures, if they exist. Therefore, the groundwater flow in the valley sediments will dominate and it will provide key control on the position of the salt water-freshwater interface. Furthermore, because of topographic highs that surround the valley, the hydraulic heads are expected to be higher than in the valley sediments, inhibiting saltwater ingress. As presented in Section 3.3 in Appendix 5.6-A of the EAC Application/EIS, based on monitoring data (2010-2014), tidal elevations exceeded groundwater elevation only in rare occasions between July and September of each monitoring year. During these high tide intervals, there is an inferred landward gradient in the immediate vicinity of the shoreline; however, its duration is inherently less than the corresponding periods of southwards gradient associated with lower tidal position. Accordingly, the net groundwater flow direction during the entire monitoring period is confirmed to be southwards toward the marine foreshore. Moreover, monitoring data indicate that the saltwater wedge could be located at greater depths than approximately -30 m elevation; analytical calculations based on methodology presented in Domenico and Schwartz (1990) showed that, due to relatively high groundwater flow in the alluvial sediments, the saltwater edge could be depressed to the depth of the overburden/bedrock contact within 50 m to 150 m of the ocean shore. Based on these observations, the potential presence of a fault structure in bedrock in the vicinity of the project area is not considered to influence groundwater flow direction in the valley sediments or increase the risk of saltwater intrusion.</p>
3509	692 - 7	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 6: Unsuitable location</p> <p>This proposal would locate a noisy, dusty gravel mine and crush mill next to an existing multi-residential area. In 2009 SCR D said no to a permit for an aggregate operation at McNab Creek. There was concern re noise and dust from onsite crushing, sorting, weighing, and stockpiling, all of which Burnco plans to do. Why allow these activities now?</p> <p>Recommendation: To do so would represent atrocious planning, with little/no obvious compensating factors. It should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Accepted EA practice in BC and Canada includes the identification of mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible (i.e., practical) means of preventing or reducing to an acceptable level any potential adverse effect of the proposed project. BCEAO (2013) considers mitigation to be any practical means or measures taken to avoid, minimize, restore on-site, compensate, or offset the potential adverse effects of a project. Compensation means measures taken to further reduce the residual effect, and may include direct physical measures (e.g., habitat enhancement, restoration or creation on, near or away from the project site), or financial mechanisms that have the outcome of reducing the residual effect (e.g., contributions to research, recovery plans, population enhancement programs for endangered species). Offset is defined in the BCMOE's Procedures for Mitigating Impacts on Environmental Values (2012) as means to counteract, or make up for, a residual impact on an environmental component.</p> <p>Potential effects on McNab Creek are being mitigated through avoidance. There are no proposed discharges to or withdrawals from McNab Creek. The pit lake is being designed such that lake elevation can be used to manage hydrostatic pressure during operations so changes to groundwater flow do not lead to a loss of flow within McNab Creek. Similarly, the size and location of the processing area was selected to avoid identified fish habitat.</p> <p>Examples of mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sediment and erosion control planning and monitoring the effectiveness of prescribed measures</li> <li>- Restricting clearing of wildlife habitat during breeding and calving periods, bird nesting periods and elk overwintering</li> <li>- Installing nest boxes for Western screech-owls in nearby forest habitat</li> <li>- Maintaining vegetation linkages and buffers to minimize habitat fragmentation and to allow escape routes for large mammals.</li> <li>- Monitoring for marine mammals during impact pile driving activities and maintaining a marine mammal safety zone based on injury noise threshold criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of compensation or offset measure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constructing a 790 metre extension of the lower segment of groundwater channel WC2 that will collect surface flow diverted through loss of the upper segment of WC2. This offset will increase the wetted area of the lower segment of WC2.</li> <li>- Establishing 1,250 m2 of new amphibian breeding ponds to offset the loss of existing amphibian habitat.</li> </ul>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3510	692 - 8	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project will lead to the loss of approximately 200 m<sup>2</sup> of spawning habitat in the upper section of WC2 however, this loss is addressed by the Fish Habitat Offset Plan (Appendix 5.1-B). The offset plan proposes to extend the length of the existing lower section of WC2 by approximately 790 m. The proposed design for the channel extension uses the existing lower channel as a template and it will meet the factors and criteria that are generally accepted for the construction of a functional groundwater-fed spawning channel. It should provide conditions similar to the existing run habitat in the lower section of WC2 that was designed as chum spawning habitat by DFO and where spawning activity was observed during the November 2016 survey.</p> <p>The creation of the pit lake is predicted to cause a doubling of groundwater influx into the lower section of WC2. The increase in ground water influx will lead to additional groundwater upwelling and the increased upwelling is expected to provide increased levels of intergravel flow that will be suitable for eggs and alevins. The average depth in the proposed offset habitat extension and the remaining section of WC2 is predicted to be above 0.3 m making it suitable for salmon spawning. As described in the Aquatic Health assessment provided in Surface Water Resources (Section 5.5.7.2), the water quality and temperature of ground and surface water entering the offset habitat and existing lower section of WC2 will be suitable for salmonids to complete all stages of their life history including spawning.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Technical Working Group, the design of the habitat offset plan was revised to allow approximately 20 m of pool habitat upstream of the culvert and approximately 20 m of gravel bed run habitat downstream of the culvert to be retained which will avoid approximately 232 m<sup>2</sup> of habitat loss. The design of the channel extension incorporates run and pool habitat in approximately a 1 : 1 ratio, based on this design and the use of run habitat for spawning in the existing lower channel it is expected that more than 2, 000 m<sup>2</sup> of the offset channel habitat will provide conditions suitable for salmonid spawning.</p>
3511	692 - 9	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 7: The Fish Habitat offset plan may not work</p> <p>The Proponent has no experience operating aggregate mine in the marine environment (contrary to claims by the Project Manager, a mine near the Bow River in Calgary does not qualify as “marine”). The proposed “compensation channel” is key to attempts to mitigate the loss of fish habitat in this project. Should it fail, even partially, accountability and compensation for the loss should be automatic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval of this proposal should include a contingency bond to fund maintenance of the new streamway, an overflow gate from the pit lake, and a fully-funded alternate solution should the offset plan fail. The bond should also be sufficient to cover site remediation at end-of-project.</p>	<p>Mines Act permitting is required which includes provisions for a performance and reclamation bond. In addition, a letter of credit is typically required as part of the Fisheries Act authorization until the works are determined to be functioning as intended.</p> <p>Details regarding the proposed Environmental management and monitoring programs for the Proposed Project are provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 16 and 17 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Environment monitoring plans will be developed by qualified environmental professionals and implemented to achieve compliance with Certificate conditions and with terms and conditions of regulatory permits and approvals. Monitoring will consist of two main components: compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. BURNCO commits to providing the funding for these monitoring initiatives.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3512	692 - 10	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	The McNab Creek strata title properties are located more than 1000' from any component of the proposed Project.
3513	692 - 11	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3514	692 - 12	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential noise effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 9.2 of the in the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise levels were predicted using computer noise models for various construction phases and operational scenarios using the same type of equipment that will be used on site. The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, schedule screening, equipment maintenance), potential residual noise effects of the Proposed Project were determined to be negligible.</p> <p>A noise management plan will be developed prior to construction, which will include a commitment to noise monitoring and a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners.</p>
3515	692 - 13	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 8: Sightline, noise and dust: The proposed mine is far too close to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The McNab Creek strata title properties are well within 500' of the proposed mining operations. Because of unsightliness, the adverse effects on property values, noise and dust issues, gravel mining operations are generally not allowed within 1000' of any residential property. Other BURNCO properties have had 1,000' separation zones stipulated as conditions of their licenses to operate. Example: BURNCO property in Parkland County, Alberta. See <a href="http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf">http://www.parklandcounty.com/Assets/Governance/Subdivision+and+Development+Appeal+Board+Minutes/SDAB+Minutes+Jan+21.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Because of the confined topography of the area, mitigation of these damaging effects is impractical. Should full compensation for loss not be acceptable to local homeowners, this mine should not be approved.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3516	692 - 14	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 9: Air quality, which will inevitably deteriorate in the vicinity of the mine, is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>There are no air quality (for dust, particulates) monitoring stations in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Air quality monitoring , with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public , should be part of any approval of the project.</p> <p>Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where air quality falls below pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential air quality effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation such as enclosing material drop areas and use of mist sprays were incorporated into the air quality model develop to assess particulate matter concentrations (TSP, PM10 and PM 2.5) at the closest potential receptors sites. NO2 and SO2 predictions were also determined for sensitive receptor sites.</p> <p>Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EIS, BURNCO has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Following the application of proposed mitigation, all potential air quality effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3517	692 - 15	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 10: The impact of marine noise is insufficiently studied in the application</p> <p>The impact of marine noise (from the conveyor belts –tugs, barge loading and water taxis) on cetaceans, herring, salmon (spawning adult and habituating juveniles) and other at-risk species (including waterfowl) is underestimated in the “science” work done by the Proponent</p> <p>Recommendation: Marine noise transmits 5-10 times farther &amp; faster through water than through air. Marine noise should be carefully baselined and monitored in wide spatial and temporal dimensions around the site Periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where marine noise exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>The noise model developed for the prediction of noise effects for this project accounted for noise propagation over water and attenuation (or lack thereof) due to barriers and topography. The model included conservative assumptions such as modelling a downwind condition in every direction from the project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential injury/mortality and behavioural disturbance of marine fish and marine mammals from underwater noise generated by impact pile driving, vessel traffic, and loading aggregate onto barges, and</li> <li>- potential behavioural disturbance in marine birds from in-air noise generated during site clearing, construction, and operations.</li> </ul> <p>After mitigation, the significance of potential injury/mortality effects of underwater noise on marine fish and marine mammals was determined to be negligible. The significance of potential for behaviour disturbance of marine fish and marine birds was negligible. The significance of potential for behavioural disturbance of marine mammals was not significant; any potential behavioral disturbance of marine mammals as a result of Proposed Project vessel noise is predicted to be localized, temporary, and reversible, with marine mammals either habituating to noise and remaining in the area, or leaving temporarily and returning once the noise has subsided. Given that no hearing impairment effects are likely and that no critical or sensitive marine mammal habitats occur within the RSA, no effects at the population level are anticipated for any marine mammal species known to frequent the RSA. Potential behavioral disturbance due to cumulative vessel noise effects is not predicted to result in a substantial change to the viability of marine mammal health in the RSA (i.e., the ability of the population to function over time within the defined spatial and temporal boundary).</p> <p>Measures for mitigating potential effects on Marine Resources, including noise effects on marine fish, mammals and birds, are detailed in Volume 2, Part B - Section 5.2.5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3518	692 - 16	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 11: Plant lighting</p> <p>The McNab area (and much of Howe Sound) is currently a dark zone, allowing residents visibility of the wonders of the night sky. Plant lighting will destroy this local value for much of the year.</p> <p>Recommendation: Any approval must come with strict (and measurable) restrictions on lighting intensity and local dispersion. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where light intensities exceed pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential visual effect of installed artificial lighting on sensitive night-time receptors have also been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Residents of McNab Creek Strata and recreational marine users in Thornbrough Channel are likely to be most affected. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. There is a potential to contribute to an increase in scenic character post closure. Potential residual effects were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.</p>
3519	692 - 17	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>Wash water will be processed for removal of fines and silt in a 95% efficient wash plant to be fed using recycled water from two large storage tanks. Fines will not be discharged to the estuary; they will be deposited in a designated inland fines area and covered in accordance with an approved Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3520	692 - 18	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential surface water and groundwater effects of the Proposed Project are presented in Volume 2, Part B – Sections 5.5 Surface Water Resources) and 5.6 (Groundwater Resources) of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Positive effects on the flows in McNab Creek are predicted to result from reducing the rate of flow loss to the groundwater system. Increased baseflows are also predicted in the foreshore minor streams. Water quality predictions are below applicable Water Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Groundwater flow is predicted to be less than the baseline during the first 15 years of operation. This loss represents a gain in flow in McNab Creek. Groundwater flow at closure will be controlled through adaptive management of the overflow structure. No water quality parameters are predicted to exceed BCWQG or CCME Guidelines.</p>
3521	692 - 19	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 12: Water Quality is insufficiently characterized in the application</p> <p>Removing sediment in the water discharged into the ocean is critical to habitat protection, not least for the nearby eel grass beds and glass sponge reefs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Siltation monitoring (both in the original and compensation channels and in the nearby ocean), with periodic reporting of results that are auditable and accessible to the public, should be part of any approval of the project. Local authorities (eg. SCRD) should have the power to compel a reduction, suspension or cessation of mine activities where sediment/siltation exceeds pre-agreed norms.</p>	<p>A Water Management Plan, currently being prepared for inclusion in the Mines Act and Water Sustainability Act Permit applications, will provide a long-term water management strategy that includes the management of water resources, a mitigation plan to reduce potential effects to water resources and an effects monitoring plan to monitor water resources in the receiving environment. The plan is designed to meeting the preliminary mitigation measures and commitments and assurances outlined in the EAC Application/EIS and those required by the Water Sustainability Act. Based on the water quantity and water quality monitoring programs (hydraulic heads and quality), if observed water levels and water quality start to show a trend towards potential negative effects to the receiving environment, then adaptive management will be undertaken. Adaptive management techniques to be implemented as required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to evaluate the extent of the pit during operations.</li> <li>- During the wet season, if water levels in the pit lake become higher than has been designed for the Pit Lake Containment Berm then the valves in the culverts will be closed to reduce the amount of water reporting to the pit from the surface water on the western slope.</li> <li>- The height of the pit lake at the outlet structure can be adjusted to increase or decrease the level of the pit lake (e.g., adding or lowering stop logs) at closure to maintain the hydraulic gradient between McNab Creek and the Project Area following closure.</li> </ul>
3522	692 - 20	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 13: "Daytime Hours" definition</p> <p>The Proponent advertises that the plant will operate only on weekdays and during "daytime hours". Daylight hours vary seasonally, but the definition of "daytime hours" is unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly define "daytime hours" in the proposal.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project will be in operations 8 to 10 hrs/day, 260 days/year (i.e., 5 days/week). The frequency of barge loading will be one every other day and it will take approximately 2 to 3 hrs to load each barge. All operational work will occur during seasonal daylight hours; the duration of work hours will vary depending on the time of year. As per the SCRD noise bylaw, operations will be limited to 7 AM to 9 PM, with the exception of holidays.</p> <p>Additional details regarding Proposed Project operations are provided in Volume 1, Part A – Section 2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3523	692 - 21	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 14: The nearshore strip of forest cover is too narrow</p> <p>The strip of forest cover between the pit and the ocean is too narrow to be sustainable. Blowdown and saltwater invasion will threaten its existence</p> <p>Recommendation: For reasons of sustainability and visual camouflage, increase the width of the ocean-pit separation strip, and lessen the size of the proposed pit and crushing area.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of potential visual effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The Proposed Project is predicted to present a relatively small level of visual change to the landscape with effects diminishing with increasing viewing distance. Following the application of proposed mitigation (e.g., layout, screening, revegetation, suitable lighting), potential effects are not predicted to demonstrate an evident contrast with the current landscape character or to produce a noticeable decline in the current level of visual quality. Maintaining a treed buffer along the foreshore (approx. 25-50 m wide adjacent to the processing area) will also limit dust and noise emissions to the marine environment. Additional screening of lan-based structures may be possible around project components not currently screened by existing vegetation. The nature and extent of vegetation screening incorporated into the site design will be described in the Vegetation Management Plan (Volume 3, Part E, Section 16 of the EAC Application/EIS).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential vegetation effects (including windthrow effects) of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3 of the EAC Application/EIS. The significance of windthrow effects were determined to be negligible; few new windward edges will be created. Monitoring of treeline edges will be conducted to evaluate potential windthrow effects and adaptive management will be employed, if necessary.</p>
3524	692 - 22	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 15: Loss of property values in the nearby strata units</p> <p>The proponent claims little or no loss of value for nearby properties. This assertion is contradicted by many studies that have highlighted the loss of value (including the value associated with quiet enjoyment) at or near industrial sites adjacent to established residential areas. Recent jurisprudence in BC has borne out the right of homeowners to receive compensation for that loss. See <a href="http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882">http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grace-isletcontroversy-ends-as-b-c-steps-in-to-buy-land-1.2906882</a></p> <p>Recommendation: Fair market value compensation for loss of property value must form part of the economic analysis of any approval for this mine.</p>	<p>Potential effects on real estate values are presented in Section 6.1 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>The closest property owners to the Proposed Project is the McNab Creek Strata located east of McNab Creek, approximately 500 metres from the northern boundary of the BURNCO property. Mitigation is proposed to address potential nuisance effects such as changes in air quality, visual quality and noise levels; all related potential effects were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p> <p>Additional mitigation is proposed that is designed to offset potential changes in real estate values of these properties that will likely enhance their marketplace value (e.g., access arrangements and potential interconnection to BC Hydro electricity service to enable the elimination of fossil fuel fired generator use).</p> <p>BURNCO is committed to being a good neighbour and has initiated discussions with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of mutual benefit and concern. BURNCO is consulting with the community on a Community Enhancement Fund that would be allocated to the surrounding community. These discussion are ongoing.</p>
3525	692 - 23	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 16: First Nation consultation – Sechelt FN was omitted this time</p> <p>Squamish and Tseil-Waututh First Nations have been consulted re Burnco, but not the Sechelt FN. The Sechelt First Nations weren't consulted about the gravel quarry at McNab Creek in 2009 either. McNab Creek is in Sechelt traditional territory.</p> <p>Recommendation: Respect/consult with Sechelt First Nations re Burnco.</p>	<p>First Nation consultation requirements are delegated to Proponents by the Crown. For the Proposed Project, only Squamish Nation and the Tseil-Waututh Nation were identified as potentially affected first Nations by the BCEAO. The CEA Agency identified additional Aboriginal Group, however, the Sechelt First Nation was not among these, presumably because of the proximity of the proposed Project to their Traditional Territory.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3526	692 - 24	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 17: Advisory Committee of voluntary citizens</p> <p>In 2009 when a gravel quarry at McNab Creek was turned down by SCRD, one requirement was an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens to provide ongoing input with the goal of community acceptance of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Require the formation of an Advisory Committee of volunteer citizens.</p>	<p>BURNCO will establish a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to provide a forum for interested stakeholders to review, discuss and make recommendations. CAG terms of reference and meeting minutes will be made available online.</p>
3527	692 - 25	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 18: The job benefits were analyzed on the basis of too narrow an RAA.</p> <p>BURNCO currently sources its aggregate from Jervis Inlet, Port McNeil and Coquitlam. To gauge the benefits to the BC economy, the net job creation figures (i.e. McNab's 12 jobs less the job losses at the above aggregate sources) as a consequence of allowing the McNab Creek operation must be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: If there is little or no net job gain to BC as a result of this proposal, it should be firmly rejected. Jobs in areas like Port McNeil are much harder to come by than in the Lower Mainland/ Howe Sound.</p>	<p>The local spatial study area for the operations phase labour market effects (including employment) of the Proposed project was described in the Application Information Requirements/EIS Guidelines, which was approved by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency on December 16, 2014 after review by the Technical Working Group established to guide the assessment. This local spatial study area is Sunshine Coast Regional District.</p> <p>The current and future demand for aggregates in BC's Lower Mainland and in major cities along the US west coast from various buyers for construction projects is robust. As a result of this demand, aggregate supply sources on and near the BC coast are expected to continue to experience strong buyer interest over the long term for their products.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3528	692 - 26	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 19: Barge traffic will diminish Howe Sound's recreational and tourism potential and add to the cumulative traffic hazard in Howe Sound</p> <p>Shipping 1-4 million tonnes of aggregate annually from this location will make for 2-6 tug/barge movements daily through Southern Howe Sound,. Routes would cross very busy sailing and small-boat recreational areas, the Howe Sound Marine Trail and ferry routes, the path of LNG tankers exiting from the Woodfibre LNG plant and freighters from Squamish Terminals. This exponentially increases the risk of collisions and loss of life in a narrow waterway and diminishes the amenity and tourism use of the Sound. The cumulative effects and worst-case hazard analysis of this project have been underestimated by the Proponent.</p> <p>Recommendation: A cumulative impact assessment, including loss of amenity and tourism value of the Sound, should be completed prior to deciding on this application. So too should a study of the increased hazards associated with increasing the large-vessel traffic in Howe Sound. Improvements to vessel tracking, buoys and channel markers in the area will be necessary.</p>	<p>Section 7.2 of the EAC Application/EIS presents a marine transportation assessment, including potential wake effects from the Proposed Project-related vessel traffic on shoreline infrastructure, and potential interference with navigation use and navigability due to Proposed Project-related infrastructure and vessel traffic.</p> <p>There is no potential interaction between potential wake effects and shoreline infrastructure, therefore the nature of this interaction was determined to be negligible. The potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability associated with Project-related infrastructure was determined to be negligible following the implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Potential effects of the Proposed Project on navigation use and navigability due to Project associated vessel traffic during construction and operations was determined to be not significant as the frequency of small vessels changing direction and speed to move out of the paths of larger vessels is expected to increase only slightly.</p> <p>Proposed Project-related barging may interact with Woodfibre LNG carriers along a small section of the Project's barging route. However, potential interactions between vessels would occur infrequently and potential cumulative residual effects are expected to be not significant following implementation of mitigation measures which include marine transportation management planning involving Canada Coast Guard, Pacific Pilotage Authority, the selected tug operator, BURNCO and other key maritime stakeholders – including Woodfibre LNG – to identify mutually agreeable operating practices.</p>
3529	692 - 27	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 20: The job benefits analysis used the questionable input-output econometric model.</p> <p>BURNCO has used input-output econometric analysis to predict the job creation benefits accruing to the project For resource projects, this is a highly questionable analysis technique. The Australian Institute has written a convincing argument highlighting the inadequacies of input-output analysis. See <a href="http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf">http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/TB%2012%20The%20use%20and%20abuse%20of%20economic%20modelling%20in%20Australia_4.pdf</a> (Input-output was used by the BC Government in arriving at its inflated job estimates for BC's LNG industry.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Red-do the employment estimates and repost/ allow additional time for public scrutiny and comments</p>	<p>The environmental assessment of the Proposed Project used an input-output (I-O) impact modelling methodology to estimate the Project's potential effect on employment (as well as other economic parameters). The B.C. Input-Output Model (BCIOM) was used. The BCIOM is maintained by BC Stats, which is the central statistics agency of the B.C. government. The BCIOM is a version of Statistics Canada's Inter-Provincial Input-Output Model (IPIOM) which BC Stats calibrated for undertaking economic analyses of B.C.-based projects. The BCIOM is a robust, calibrated, third party provided input-output model, and has been previously accepted for use by by the BCEAO and the CEA Agency to assist with estimating the economic impact of proposed projects.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3530	692 - 28	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 21: There was an inconsistency between the job creation figures shown in 2 different slides in the Open Houses</p> <p>One showed about 300 person-years of employment (over 25years). The other (derived from input-output analysis) showed person-year employment benefits several times that amount.</p> <p>Recommendation: This misleading discrepancy should be resolved by further analysis, and that section of the application re-submitted, with additional time allowed for public scrutiny and comment</p>	<p>The estimated number of jobs created by the proposed Project during construction and operations phases are presented in Section 2.5.4 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Employment numbers were presented on three Open House display panels, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Specifications: 80 person years during construction and 360 person years during operations (direct, indirect and induced);</li> <li>- Project Benefits: 12 full-time jobs at the site (i.e. direct only);</li> <li>- Sustainable Economy: 119 jobs during construction and 99 jobs during operations (direct, indirect and induced); 33 long-term jobs during operations are expected to be filled by Sunshine Coast residents.</li> </ul>
3531	692 - 29	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 22: Preservation of marine tourism, hiking access to the vicinity of McNab</p> <p>Moorages, anchorages, swimming facilities and back-country access have long been part of the McNab Creek area's attractions for Howe Sound visitors and local boating clubs</p> <p>Recommendation: The application fails to properly address how these local amenities will be protected. Neither does it propose how loss of these amenities will be compensated for. The Management Plan should address this issue.</p>	<p>Harvesting fish and wildlife' and 'Outdoor recreation and tourism' are valued components in the environmental assessment of the Proposed Project (see Table 7.3-1). No displacement effects on recreational hunting or other recreational activities is anticipated due to the Proposed Project because the primary access to the local study area is through the Proposed Property, and public access and use of the Proposed Property has never been permitted. During the construction and operation phases, recreationists and tourists would continue to have access to the foreshore area below the high water mark and to the anchorage area in the vicinity of where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound.</p> <p>Proposed Project construction and operations would prevent marine-based recreational and tourism activities occurring around the Project jetty. As the jetty is located within an existing log boom tenure and recreational and tourism activities are concentrated on the eastern side of the local study area (where McNab Creek enters Howe Sound), this effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Displacement on the water would occur on an intermittent basis as a result of Proposed Project-related vessel traffic, which would require smaller vessels to alter direction and/or speed when navigating at the same time as water taxis or barges (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2). These navigational challenges are present in the LSA due to forestry activity, and are subject to the Collision Regulations of the Canada Shipping Act. Any resulting effects on recreational boating recreational activities due to potential interactions of recreational vessels and equipment and Project-associated vessels are not detectable or not measureable, so potential effects of the Proposed Project on water-based recreation and tourism access matters in the construction and operation phases are determined to be negligible.</p> <p>As part of the Marine Transport Management Plan outlined in Marine Transport (Volume 2, Part B - Section 7.2), BURNCO would also develop and implement strategies, best management practices and guidelines to avoid and minimise Proposed Project - related disruption of marine-based recreational activities during construction and operations. As part of the development of this plan, BURNCO would consult with key marine user groups (e.g., McNab Strata, yacht clubs, camps, and kayaking operators) to discuss strategies (including but not limited to routing options) to manage the interaction of Proposed Project vessel traffic with recreational and tourism areas during the high season months.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3532	692 - 30	My Sea to Sky	Not Stated	<p>Issue 23: End-of-project remediation</p> <p>The compensation channel is an artificial structure which will likely not survive long after project's end.</p> <p>Recommendation: Restoring the natural streamway should be a firm end-state requirement.</p>	<p>A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan is provided in Volume 4, Part G – Section 22.0: Appendix 4 of the EAC Application/EIS. The plan describes the proposed measures and commitments to manage, maintain and monitor water management structures, remove surface facilities, and reclaim areas and develop a functional ecosystem in the freshwater pit.</p> <p>Progressive and ongoing reclamation activities will occur throughout all phases of mine development. The Proposed Project will use progressive reclamation of the site that includes ongoing reclamation activities taking place alongside active extraction and pit area around the proposed operations area. Site planning will include landscaping, further design and development of the existing berm along the north edge logging road of the pit area, along with the creation of southern pit containment berm, surface water features, fisheries habitats and vegetation throughout the site consistent with the operational extraction schedule. Ongoing monitoring will be conducted for relevant noise and dust, water quality parameters, and fish, vegetation and wildlife resources. Details regarding the monitoring program (in addition to the reclamation monitoring suggested in the plan) is provided in Volume 3, Part E – Section 17.0 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p>
3533	693 - 1	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	<p>Please find attached the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District (SLRD) submission in response to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (the Agency) and B.C.'s Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) invitation for the public to comment as part of the ongoing environmental assessment of the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project. The SLRD is appreciative of the opportunity to provide comments and the extension received to accommodate SLRD Board meeting schedules.</p>	<p>No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.</p>
3534	693 - 2	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	<p>With respect to Air Quality and Noise issues, should the Ministers decide to issue an Environmental Assessment Certificate (EAC), SLRD staff feel that the EAC needs to include conditions to address Air Quality and Noise problems and clearly identify the province or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement.</p>	<p>BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.</p>
3535	693 - 3	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	<p>Further, information from monitoring must be made publically available.</p>	<p>BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation of project effects</li> <li>- Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours</li> <li>- Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc.</li> <li>- Children's camps</li> <li>- Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs</li> <li>- Public amenities</li> </ul> <p>The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.</p>

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3536	693 - 4	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	The SLRD, through involvement with the Howe Sound Community Forum, is aware of and supportive of research work currently underway regarding glass sponge reefs in Howe Sound. As such, SLRD staff echo SCRD's recommendation that more thorough studies and surveys should be completed on glass sponge reef presence within 200 m of any at of the project area. SLRD staff are also supportive of the other recommendations made by SCRD staff, included below.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3537	693 - 5	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan needs to be implemented at the outset of the project to allow for mature vegetation cover and for adjustments to be made to ensure the plan functions as expected;	BURNCO has committed to constructing the habitat offset channel extension prior to construction of the Project and effects to the existing groundwater fed channel.
3538	693 - 6	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Sufficient funds should be set aside by BURNCO to allow for long term maintenance of the new stream and related infrastructure, such as the overflow gate and a channel from the pit lake, to ensure the plan functions as expected and to include a contingency plan to be followed if the compensation plan fails.	Agreed, BURNCO expects that the provision of a letter of credit covering monitoring, construction and maintenance of any habitat offsetting will be required under the fisheries protection provisions of the Fisheries Act.
3539	693 - 7	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The impact on salmonids of contaminants in the water column due to disturbance of sediment needs to be assessed;	Project activities with potential to result in re-suspension of sediments as a result of seafloor disturbance are limited to the following: pile installation, vessel propeller scour, and vessel wake wash. The impacts of altered water quality (including increased contaminant exposure) on salmonids as a result of seabed disturbance and subsequent sediment resuspension from the above listed activities has been assessed under Vol. 2 of the EAC Application (refer to Section 5.2.5.2.1.1, Section 5.2.5.2.3.1, Section 5.2.5.4.1.1 and Section 5.2.5.4.1.3). Mitigation measures that will be implemented to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects associated with sediment disturbance are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1 and Table 5.2-18 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3540	693 - 8	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. More thorough studies and surveys should be completed on glass sponge reef presence within 200m of any part of the project area, and along any loaded barge transit routes, during the life of the project;	Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.
3541	693 - 9	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The possible presence and impact on Northern Abalone, a species at risk, needs to be assessed;	As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed intertidal and subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic dive surveys in the marine environment using DFO-certified abalone biologists. The field surveys concluded that no abalone or abalone habitat were present in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint, as indicated in Section 5.2.5.5.1.2 of the EAC Application. Potential adverse impacts of the Project on abalone and abalone habitat were therefore considered to be negligible – not significant (Table 5.2-25).
3542	693 - 10	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals, or marine birds, becomes applicable during the life of the project then impacts of noise generating activity need to be re-evaluated and updated mitigation measures applied;	If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals or marine birds becomes applicable during the construction phase of the Project, then mitigation measures with respect to managing acoustic noise emissions will be based on the most current legislation.
3543	693 - 11	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	v. Vessel operators should receive an appropriate amount of training on how to avoid impact with marine mammals, as part of overall environmental related training, and records need to be kept of any incidents.	Mitigation measures applicable to vessel operators to avoid and/or minimize potential physical interactions between vessels and marine mammals are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. This includes methods in how to avoid ship strikes on marine mammals. Vessel operators will be required to record any potential incidents involving a marine mammal strike.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3544	693 - 12	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Consideration to reclamation of other portions of BURNCO's property should be set out as a means of identifying potential offset areas to mitigate negative impacts, such as the loss of land to the pit lake, and provide habitat enhancements.	The Proposed Project footprint was sited in an area with a long history of anthropogenic disturbance to minimize impacts to undisturbed habitat (including mature forest) and to generally minimize adverse effects on terrestrial resources. A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan will be developed and will outline the goals associated with wildlife habitat restoration, methods of rehabilitating wildlife habitat, and parameters to gauge the success of reclamation. Habitat reclamation will occur progressively over the life of the Proposed Project to return habitat to a functional capability for supporting wildlife as soon as possible. A detailed wildlife mitigation and monitoring plan has not yet been developed but will be developed as part of the Wildlife Management (Protection) Plan to minimize impacts on terrestrial resources and to collect data that will help evaluate the effectiveness of implemented mitigations.
3545	693 - 13	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Air quality monitoring stations should be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern part of Gambier Island, and in a location along the Sea to Sky corridor, for the life of the project and these monitoring stations should be established at the outset of the project in order to establish meaningful baseline information;	Air quality monitoring will begin prior to the Project operations.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EAC the Project Proponent has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7.  The predicted air quality concentrations as a result of the Proposed Project, in combination with existing levels were predicted to be well below the relevant air quality criteria at Gambier Island (Ekins Point) and along the Sea to Sky Corridor.
3546	693 - 14	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Information from the air quality monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Air quality monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.
3547	693 - 15	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address air quality problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	The comment is noted.  In addition to conditions stipulated in the Environmental Assessment Certificate, relevant permitting will also be undertaken following receipt of an Environmental Assessment Certificate.
3548	693 - 16	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. Aggregate composition tests need to be done to ensure that harmful chemicals are not released during processing.	The project related release of metals within particulate matter to the air (that was used in the human health risk assessment) was based on site specific testing of the aggregate. No significant effects to public health were predicted (Volume 2, Part B, Section 9.1).
3549	693 - 17	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Noise monitoring stations need to be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern area of Gambier Island for the life of the project;	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.
3550	693 - 18	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Information from the noise monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Details of processing the noise monitoring results will be determined in the Noise Management Plan. Noise monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.
3551	693 - 19	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address noise problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	Measures for mitigating potential noise effects are presented in Table 18-1 of the EAC Application/EIS. A Noise Management Plan will be developed, which will include a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners. BURNCO will establish a mutually agreeable mechanism for engaging with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of benefit or concern.
3552	693 - 20	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. Site operations shall be consistent with Sunshine Coast Regional District Noise Control Bylaw No. 597, 2008.	Operations will be restricted to 7 AM to 9 PM, consistent with the SCRDC Noise Control Bylaw section regarding Machine Noise.
3553	693 - 21	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The SCRDC supports BURNCO'S commitment to local hiring and procurement;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3554	693 - 22	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. The SCRDC supports BURNCO'S commitment to reaching a benefit agreement with the McNab Strata community;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.
3555	693 - 23	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. Marine tourism activities should be incorporated into the Access Management Plan.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will have relevant information for all marine vessels, including marine tourism vessels, and for operators of tourism facilities that have a marine component, such as summer camps.
3556	693 - 24	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Recreational access to existing anchorages in the area need to be maintained;	Anchorage by Project and non-project vessels within the Project's marine control zone will be subject to the direction and specifications of the Marine Transport Management Plan, and this document will incorporate Transport Canada requirements and reflect Navigation Protection Program permitting (which the Proposed Project is subject to).
3557	693 - 25	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Adequate safety lighting needs to be installed on marine facilities.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will specify aids and navigational lights as per Project planning and the Navigation Protection Program permitting process. The navigational aids and lights specified in this plan will be installed and maintained.
3558	693 - 26	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The SCRDC Lighting Guidelines must be followed for the lifetime of the project.	Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.
3559	693 - 27	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	As the net cumulative residual effects for grizzly bear were determined to be significant, with the Proposed Project contributing to factors limiting the population, and combined with the effects of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable project and activities (7% (528 ha) of suitable grizzly bear foraging habitat is predicted to be lost in the RSA), SLRD staff feel that significant attention must be given to this cumulative issue with EA conditions reflecting this.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.  Grizzly bears in the RSA are limited by mortality due to human interactions (hunting, poaching, destruction of problem bears) rather than habitat. The project will not contribute to the factors limiting this sensitive population because the Project will not contribute to grizzly bear mortality. Therefore, the effects of the Project on grizzly bears are not significant. Other anthropogenic activities in the RSA have the potential to result in grizzly bear mortality, and therefore may contribute to the factor limiting grizzly bear populations in the RSA. As a result, the cumulative effects of human activities in the RSA on grizzly bears are significant.
3560	693 - 28	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	Finally, comparing Project GHG emissions to provincial, national and global emissions and thus determining the contribution of Project emissions are considered negligible undermines local efforts and local Climate Plans, targets and goals. Local governments are mandated to include GHG reduction targets in their Official Community Plans and Regional Growth Strategies. It would be helpful for local governments if the Proposed Project GHG emissions were compared to local emissions, as well as provincial, national and global emissions. This local comparison is conducted for other Valued Components, such as Labour Market, and allows local governments and the public to understand how such project contribute to local plans, targets and goals.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure. The assessment methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. Estimated Project-related direct and indirect GHG emissions are presented in Table 5.8-10 and Table 5.8-11. respectively.  Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3561	693 - 29	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	SLRD Board consideration of the Proposed Project further highlights the need for the Province to complete its Cumulative Effects Assessment of Howe Sound. The Agency and EAO indicated that they are very interested in understanding SLRD's key issues and concern with the Project - cumulative effects are a key issue and concern of the SLRD. The SLRD strongly encourages the Province to obtain more information on cumulative impacts before projects like the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project (BURNCO) move forward and to complete the CEA so that it is available to local governments to help inform their decision making when assessing projects such as BURNCO.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: - Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4. - Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.  As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.
3562	694 - 1	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	Please find attached the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District (SLRD) submission in response to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (the Agency) and B.C.'s Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) invitation for the public to comment as part of the ongoing environmental assessment of the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project. The SLRD is appreciative of the opportunity to provide comments and the extension received to accommodate SLRD Board meeting schedules.	No specific response to this item is required in relation to the EAC Application/EIS which is the focus of the public comment period. It will be documented in the Application Review Public Issues Tracking and included in the documentation of public consultation activities.
3563	694 - 2	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	With respect to Air Quality and Noise issues, should the Ministers decide to issue an Environmental Assessment Certificate (EAC), SLRD staff feel that the EAC needs to include conditions to address Air Quality and Noise problems and clearly identify the province or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.
3564	694 - 3	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	Further, information from monitoring must be made publically available.	BURNCO has proposed a McNab Community Enhancement Fund (CEF) that would consist of money set aside each year of operation, based on output, to enhance the McNab community through targeted funding on projects throughout the region. Funding of projects would be given priority by BURNCO's Management Committee based on a number of criteria that would include: - Mitigation of project effects - Bringing amenities to our nearest neighbours - Supporting non-political groups actively improving Howe Sound through cleanup efforts, habitat improvements, etc. - Children's camps - Local united Way or similar organizations providing funding to community programs - Public amenities  The CEF is a funding mechanism which may be replaced by a Sunshine Coast Regional District fee at some future date. If such a fee were introduced, then the CEF would cease.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3565	694 - 4	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	The SLRD, through involvement with the Howe Sound Community Forum, is aware of and supportive of research work currently underway regarding glass sponge reefs in Howe Sound. As such, SLRD staff echo SCRD's recommendation that more thorough studies and surveys should be completed on glass sponge reef presence within 200 m of any at of the project area. SLRD staff are also supportive of the other recommendations made by SCRD staff, included below.	<p>A detailed assessment of potential effects on marine resources, including marine benthic communities, is presented in Volume 2, Part B –Section 5.2 of the EAC Application/EIS.</p> <p>Glass sponges are a group of filter feeding organisms which can form large sponge reefs that provide habitat for other marine invertebrate and fish species. Glass sponges in Howe Sound live at depths as shallow as -20 m (chart datum). BURNCO has included glass sponges in the assessment of potential effects on marine resources.</p> <p>Although no glass sponges were observed during the dive and towed video surveys of the Proposed Project area, foreshore and sub-tidal nearshore conducted for the assessment, their known occurrences throughout Howe Sound have been documented. The marine footprint of the Proposed Project does not overlap with any known or mapped locations of glass sponges or glass sponge reefs occurrences.</p> <p>Potential residual effects of propeller scour and aggregate spills on glass sponges were assessed. Propeller wash velocities at the depths at which glass sponges occur are predicted to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth. With the application of proposed mitigation, the likelihood of an aggregate spill adversely affecting glass sponge colonies is low. The significance of potential residual effects on marine benthic communities, including glass sponges, were determined to be negligible or not significant.</p>
3566	694 - 5	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The Fish Habitat Offset Plan needs to be implemented at the outset of the project to allow for mature vegetation cover and for adjustments to be made to ensure the plan functions as expected;	BURNCO has committed to constructing the habitat offset channel extension prior to construction of the Project and effects to the existing groundwater fed channel.
3567	694 - 6	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Sufficient funds should be set aside by BURNCO to allow for long term maintenance of the new stream and related infrastructure, such as the overflow gate and a channel from the pit lake, to ensure the plan functions as expected and to include a contingency plan to be followed if the compensation plan fails.	Agreed, BURNCO expects that the provision of a letter of credit covering monitoring, construction and maintenance of any habitat offsetting will be required under the fisheries protection provisions of the Fisheries Act.
3568	694 - 7	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The impact on salmonids of contaminants in the water column due to disturbance of sediment needs to be assessed;	Project activities with potential to result in re-suspension of sediments as a result of seafloor disturbance are limited to the following: pile installation, vessel propeller scour, and vessel wake wash. The impacts of altered water quality (including increased contaminant exposure) on salmonids as a result of seabed disturbance and subsequent sediment resuspension from the above listed activities has been assessed under Vol. 2 of the EAC Application (refer to Section 5.2.5.2.1.1, Section 5.2.5.2.3.1, Section 5.2.5.4.1.1 and Section 5.2.5.4.1.3). Mitigation measures that will be implemented to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects associated with sediment disturbance are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1 and Table 5.2-18 of the EAC Application/EIS.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3569	694 - 8	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. More thorough studies and surveys should be completed on glass sponge reef presence within 200m of any part of the project area, and along any loaded barge transit routes, during the life of the project;	Glass sponges are known to occur throughout Howe Sound, in water depths below -20 m (chart datum). As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic surveys targeting potential sponge reef habitats. The field surveys concluded that no glass sponge reefs were present in the proposed marine infrastructure (load-out jetty or walkway/conveyor) footprint. This information agrees with known habitat preferences of these organisms (i.e., water depths in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint are shallower than the depth range in which glass sponge reefs occur). In terms of interaction of glass sponge reef habitat with shipping activities, known sponge reefs occur in proximity to the proposed shipping route in several locations, with the closest occurring at the mouth of Ramillies Channel (Volume 4, Part G - Section 22.0 - Appendix 5.2-A, Figure 3). However, water depths at these locations along the proposed shipping route are below -25 m (chart datum). As such, potential impacts from shipping would be limited to propeller wash effects at the corresponding depths of these glass sponge reef occurrences. To assess this potential impact, propeller scour impacts on the seabed were assessed at a modelled depth of -20 m (chart datum) to correspond with the uppermost depths of glass sponge habitat. Jet velocities generated by the tug propeller at -20 m were compared to natural velocities derived from wave and tidal activity in Howe Sound. Estimates of maximum horizontal velocity associated with wind waves were developed from wave hindcasts from available wind data for the Strait of Georgia using the Halibut Bank Ocean Buoy (Environment Canada Station 46146) and are summarized in Table 5.2-12. At -20 m depth, the jet velocities of the proposed tug-assisted barge movements were shown to be within the same magnitude as tidal currents present at this depth, and below the velocity threshold (0.25 m/s) required for seabed particle mobilization (USACE 1989). Given that water depths along the proposed shipping route in the RSA are typically below -20 m (chart datum), the potential effects of tug propeller scour on glass sponge assemblages in the proposed shipping corridors were considered negligible and were not carried forward in the assessment.
3570	694 - 9	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The possible presence and impact on Northern Abalone, a species at risk, needs to be assessed;	As part of marine baseline investigations, detailed underwater biophysical surveys were conducted in the proposed intertidal and subtidal footprints of the proposed marine infrastructure (as well as adjacent areas) using SCUBA and towed video survey methods, with detailed information recorded on existing habitat and species present in these areas. This included systematic dive surveys in the marine environment using DFO-certified abalone biologists. The field surveys concluded that no abalone or abalone habitat were present in the proposed marine infrastructure footprint, as indicated in Section 5.2.5.5.1.2 of the EAC Application. Potential adverse impacts of the Project on abalone and abalone habitat were therefore considered to be negligible – not significant (Table 5.2-25).
3571	694 - 10	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals, or marine birds, becomes applicable during the life of the project then impacts of noise generating activity need to be re-evaluated and updated mitigation measures applied;	If new federal government legislative criteria for acoustic injury or disturbance to marine mammals or marine birds becomes applicable during the construction phase of the Project, then mitigation measures with respect to managing acoustic noise emissions will be based on the most current legislation.
3572	694 - 11	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	v. Vessel operators should receive an appropriate amount of training on how to avoid impact with marine mammals, as part of overall environmental related training, and records need to be kept of any incidents.	Mitigation measures applicable to vessel operators to avoid and/or minimize potential physical interactions between vessels and marine mammals are outlined in Section 5.2.5.3.1.4 of the EAC Application/EIS. This includes methods in how to avoid ship strikes on marine mammals. Vessel operators will be required to record any potential incidents involving a marine mammal strike.



Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3573	694 - 12	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Consideration to reclamation of other portions of BURNCO's property should be set out as a means of identifying potential offset areas to mitigate negative impacts, such as the loss of land to the pit lake, and provide habitat enhancements.	The Proposed Project footprint was sited in an area with a long history of anthropogenic disturbance to minimize impacts to undisturbed habitat (including mature forest) and to generally minimize adverse effects on terrestrial resources. A Reclamation and Effective Closure Plan will be developed and will outline the goals associated with wildlife habitat restoration, methods of rehabilitating wildlife habitat, and parameters to gauge the success of reclamation. Habitat reclamation will occur progressively over the life of the Proposed Project to return habitat to a functional capability for supporting wildlife as soon as possible. A detailed wildlife mitigation and monitoring plan has not yet been developed but will be developed as part of the Wildlife Management (Protection) Plan to minimize impacts on terrestrial resources and to collect data that will help evaluate the effectiveness of implemented mitigations.
3574	694 - 13	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Air quality monitoring stations should be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern part of Gambier Island, and in a location along the Sea to Sky corridor, for the life of the project and these monitoring stations should be established at the outset of the project in order to establish meaningful baseline information;	Air quality monitoring will begin prior to the Project operations.  Within Section 5.7.6 of the EAC Application/EAC the Project Proponent has committed to developing an Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan. This plan will include details on ambient air and meteorological monitoring such as monitoring locations, parameters to be monitoring and instruments used to monitor. In addition, establishment of an air quality and meteorological monitoring program has been identified as a specific mitigation measure within Section 5.7.  The predicted air quality concentrations as a result of the Proposed Project, in combination with existing levels were predicted to be well below the relevant air quality criteria at Gambier Island (Ekins Point) and along the Sea to Sky Corridor.
3575	694 - 14	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Information from the air quality monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Air quality monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.
3576	694 - 15	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address air quality problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	The comment is noted.  In addition to conditions stipulated in the Environmental Assessment Certificate, relevant permitting will also be undertaken following receipt of an Environmental Assessment Certificate.
3577	694 - 16	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. Aggregate composition tests need to be done to ensure that harmful chemicals are not released during processing.	The project related release of metals within particulate matter to the air (that was used in the human health risk assessment) was based on site specific testing of the aggregate. No significant effects to public health were predicted (Volume 2, Part B, Section 9.1).
3578	694 - 17	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Noise monitoring stations need to be located within or near the McNab Strata community and in the northern area of Gambier Island for the life of the project;	Noise monitoring locations will be included as part of the Noise Management Plan. Stations will be located to monitor noise levels at the McNab Strata and at Ekins Point on Gambier Island.
3579	694 - 18	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Information from the noise monitoring stations must be made publicly available;	Details of processing the noise monitoring results will be determined in the Noise Management Plan. Noise monitoring results can be made publicly available through arrangements with BURNCO and relevant government agencies.
3580	694 - 19	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. The environmental certificate needs to include strong measures to address noise problems and clearly identify the provincial or federal agency that is responsible for enforcement;	Measures for mitigating potential noise effects are presented in Table 18-1 of the EAC Application/EIS. A Noise Management Plan will be developed, which will include a response plan to noise concerns received from nearby property owners. BURNCO will establish a mutually agreeable mechanism for engaging with the McNab Creek Strata owners regarding issues of benefit or concern.
3581	694 - 20	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iv. Site operations shall be consistent with Sunshine Coast Regional District Noise Control Bylaw No. 597, 2008.	Operations will be restricted to 7 AM to 9 PM, consistent with the SCRDC Noise Control Bylaw section regarding Machine Noise.
3582	694 - 21	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The SCRDC supports BURNCO'S commitment to local hiring and procurement;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3583	694 - 22	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. The SCRDC supports BURNCO'S commitment to reaching a benefit agreement with the McNab Strata community;	Comment acknowledged. Information is noted as being present. No further information required.
3584	694 - 23	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	iii. Marine tourism activities should be incorporated into the Access Management Plan.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will have relevant information for all marine vessels, including marine tourism vessels, and for operators of tourism facilities that have a marine component, such as summer camps.
3585	694 - 24	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. Recreational access to existing anchorages in the area need to be maintained;	Anchorage by Project and non-project vessels within the Project's marine control zone will be subject to the direction and specifications of the Marine Transport Management Plan, and this document will incorporate Transport Canada requirements and reflect Navigation Protection Program permitting (which the Proposed Project is subject to).
3586	694 - 25	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	ii. Adequate safety lighting needs to be installed on marine facilities.	The Marine Transport Management Plan (see Sec. 16.2.2.11) will specify aids and navigational lights as per Project planning and the Navigation Protection Program permitting process. The navigational aids and lights specified in this plan will be installed and maintained.
3587	694 - 26	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	i. The SCRDC Lighting Guidelines must be followed for the lifetime of the project.	Volume 2, Part B, Section 7.4.5.3.2 of the EAC Application/EIS indicates adherence to design goals contained within the Sunshine Coast Regional District Outdoor Lighting Guidelines to maintain the quality of the night-time lighting environment and avoid lighting impacts as a proposed mitigation for potential lighting effects. Additional recommendations are identified from the Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations (CIE) to avoid lighting impacts.
3588	694 - 27	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	As the net cumulative residual effects for grizzly bear were determined to be significant, with the Proposed Project contributing to factors limiting the population, and combined with the effects of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable project and activities (7% (528 ha) of suitable grizzly bear foraging habitat is predicted to be lost in the RSA), SLRD staff feel that significant attention must be given to this cumulative issue with EA conditions reflecting this.	BURNCO defers to the BCEAO on potential conditions of environmental assessment certification.  Grizzly bears in the RSA are limited by mortality due to human interactions (hunting, poaching, destruction of problem bears) rather than habitat. The project will not contribute to the factors limiting this sensitive population because the Project will not contribute to grizzly bear mortality. Therefore, the effects of the Project on grizzly bears are not significant. Other anthropogenic activities in the RSA have the potential to result in grizzly bear mortality, and therefore may contribute to the factor limiting grizzly bear populations in the RSA. As a result, the cumulative effects of human activities in the RSA on grizzly bears are significant.
3589	694 - 28	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	Finally, comparing Project GHG emissions to provincial, national and global emissions and thus determining the contribution of Project emissions are considered negligible undermines local efforts and local Climate Plans, targets and goals. Local governments are mandated to include GHG reduction targets in their Official Community Plans and Regional Growth Strategies. It would be helpful for local governments if the Proposed Project GHG emissions were compared to local emissions, as well as provincial, national and global emissions. This local comparison is conducted for other Valued Components, such as Labour Market, and allows local governments and the public to understand how such project contribute to local plans, targets and goals.	A detailed assessment of potential climate change effects of the Proposed Project is presented in Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.8 of the EAC Application/EIS. Potential effects considered were changes in GHG emissions as a result of the Project, the Project's contribution to climate change through the emission of GHG's, and how potential changes in climate will affect project-related infrastructure. The assessment methodology for the EAC Application/EIS reflects accepted EA practice in BC and Canada. Estimated Project-related direct and indirect GHG emissions are presented in Table 5.8-10 and Table 5.8-11. respectively.  Proposed mitigation includes the use of electricity instead of fossil fuels, routine maintenance of vehicles, and minimizing idling of vehicles and tugs. Mitigation measures that will reduce GHG emissions are consistent with specific actions within the Seas-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.

Issue No.	Source			Public Comment/Issue	Proponent Response
	Ref #	Commenter (Name)	Location		
3590	694 - 29	Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	Pemberton, BC	SLRD Board consideration of the Proposed Project further highlights the need for the Province to complete its Cumulative Effects Assessment of Howe Sound. The Agency and EAO indicated that they are very interested in understanding SLRD's key issues and concern with the Project - cumulative effects are a key issue and concern of the SLRD. The SLRD strongly encourages the Province to obtain more information on cumulative impacts before projects like the BURNCO Aggregate Mine Project (BURNCO) move forward and to complete the CEA so that it is available to local governments to help inform their decision making when assessing projects such as BURNCO.	Existing Land and Resource Management Plans and protection or conservation area designations were considered in assessing potential effects on land and resource uses. These are summarized in the following technical sections as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land and Resource Management Plans: Volume 2, Part B – Section 7.3.4.2.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Wildlife: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.1.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Terrestrial Vegetation: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.3.2.4.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation designations for Marine Resources: Volume 2, Part B – Section 5.2.4.</li> </ul> As a property owner and stakeholder in the area, BURNCO would be pleased to participate in a broader planning exercise for Howe Sound. EA is not typically a forum for developing new land and resource use planning areas, designations, or objectives.