

The EAO's Assessment of an Application for Certificate Amendment

**Amendment #3 – Increased Liquefaction Capacity and Workers
Accommodation**

CEDAR LNG PROJECT

REQUESTED BY:

CEDAR LNG PARTNERS (GP) LTD.

JULY 09, 2026

Pursuant to Section 32 of the Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2018, c.51



EAO

Environmental
Assessment Office

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The Act	<i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> , S.B.C. 2018, c. 51
AQO	Ambient Air Quality Objectives
Amendment Application	Application to amend the Environmental Assessment Certificate for Increased Liquefaction Capacity and Workers Accommodation
B.C.	British Columbia
BCER	B.C. Energy Regulator
CACs	Criteria Air Contaminants
CAAQS	Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards
Certificate	Environmental Assessment Certificate
CO	Carbon Monoxide
DoK	District of Kitimat
EAO	Environmental Assessment Office
FLNG	Floating Liquefied Natural Gas
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
IAAC	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
IMO	International Maritime Organization
N	Nitrogen
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
PM _{2.5}	Particulate Matter
S	Sulphur
SO ₂	Sulphur Dioxide
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
This Report	The EAO's Assessment of an Application for Certificate Amendment: for Increased Liquefaction Capacity and Workers Accommodation

Table of Contents

1.0	Overview of Cedar LNG.....	5
1.1.	Project Status	5
2.0	The Proposed Amendment	5
3.0	The Amendment Review Process.....	5
4.0	First Nation Engagement	7
5.0	Public Engagement	7
6.0	Summary of Key Issues and Effects of the Amendment.....	8
6.1.	Air Quality	8
6.1.1.	Background	8
6.1.2.	Holder's Assessment	9
6.1.3.	Key Concerns Raised	9
6.1.4.	Mitigation and Follow-up	10
6.1.5.	EAO's Assessment of Effects	10
6.2.	Human Health	10
6.2.1.	Background	10
6.2.2.	Holder's Assessment	11
6.2.3.	Key Concerns Raised	11
6.2.4.	Mitigation and Follow-up	11
6.2.5.	EAO's Assessment of Effects	11
6.3.	Acoustics.....	12
6.3.1.	Background	12
6.3.2.	Holder's Assessment	12
6.3.3.	Key Concerns Raised	12
6.3.4.	Mitigation and Follow-up	13
6.3.5.	EAO's Assessment of Effects	13
6.4.	Human and Community Well-Being.....	13
6.4.1.	Background	13
6.4.2.	Holder's Assessment	13
6.4.3.	Key Concerns Raised.....	13

6.4.4. Mitigation and Follow-up 14

6.4.5. EAO’s Assessment of Effects 14

6.5. Infrastructure and Services..... 14

6.5.1. Background 14

6.5.2. Holders Assessment 14

6.5.3. Key Concerns Raised 14

6.5.4. Mitigation and Follow-up 15

6.5.5. EAO’s Assessment of Effects 15

6.6. Effects to First Nations..... 15

6.6.1. Background 15

6.6.2. Holder’s Assessment 15

6.6.3. Key Issues Raised..... 16

6.6.4. Mitigation and Follow up 16

6.6.5. EAO’s Assessment of Effects 16

7.0 Proposed Certificate Changes and Amendment Conditions 17

8.0 Conclusions 17

1.0 OVERVIEW OF CEDAR LNG

Cedar LNG (or the Project) is an electrified Floating Liquefied Natural Gas (FLNG) export facility and marine terminal that is currently under construction, 10 kilometres southwest of the District of Kitimat, and approximately three kilometres west of Kitamaat Village. The terrestrial footprint of the Project is located on Haisla Nation-owned fee simple land.

On March 13, 2023, Environmental Assessment Certificate (Certificate) #E23-01 was issued for the Project under the [Environmental Assessment Act](#) (2002) (the Former Act). The Project is being constructed by Cedar LNG Partners (GP) Ltd. (Cedar or the Holder), a Haisla Nation-led partnership with Pembina Pipeline Corporation.

Cedar LNG required an assessment under the [Impact Assessment Act](#) (2019). The Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) conducted the Environmental Assessment as a substituted assessment to meet provincial and federal requirements in accordance with the [Impact Assessment Cooperation Agreement](#). A positive Decision Statement under the [Impact Assessment Act](#) (2019) (reference number 80208) was approved in March 2023.

The EAO has issued two amendments to the Certificate. On April 9, 2025, the EAO issued Amendment #1 to include an alternative power transmission line route, a power distribution line, and expand the marine terminal area under Section 32(1) of the [Environmental Assessment Act](#) (2018) (the Act). This amendment was also subject to assessment under the [Impact Assessment Act](#) (2019), and the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC) amended the Decision Statement on May 30, 2025. On April 9, 2026, the EAO amended the Certificate to add two temporary work areas to support project construction, based on a recommendation from the B.C. Energy Regulator (BCER) under Section 32(5) of the Act. These two temporary work areas were previously included in an amended IAAC Decision Statement issued on July 21, 2025.

1.1. Project Status

A final investment decision for the project was made in June 2024, and project construction began in July 2024. The Project is currently advancing construction within the marine terminal area, and the transmission line right-of-way is substantially complete. The FLNG is under construction in South Korea and is anticipated to be completed in 2028.

2.0 THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

On September 16, 2025, Cedar submitted an application to amend the Certificate ([Amendment Application](#)) under Section 32 of the Act and the federal Decision Statement. Cedar requested the following changes in its Amendment Application:

- Housing up to 80 workers on the FLNG facility to maximize safety and efficient operations in accordance with international and national safety conventions; and
- Increasing the Project liquefaction capacity from 400 to 500 million standard cubic feet per day of natural gas which represents an increase in LNG production from approximately 3.0 million tonnes per annum to 3.75 million tonnes per annum.

3.0 THE AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

The EAO considered the nature of the proposed physical changes to the Project in relation to the potential for effects to environmental, health, social, cultural, or economic values, First Nation interests and/or treaty rights, and other assessment matters under [Section 25](#) of the Act. Based on this analysis the EAO determined that the proposed changes consist of a “typical” amendment as defined in the EAO’s [Amendments to Environmental Assessment Certificates and Exemption Orders Guidance](#).

The EAO considered the potential effects and the scope of the Amendment and notified all potentially impacted First Nations from the original environmental assessment including Haisla Nation, Gitga’at First Nation, Gitxaala Nation, Kitselas First Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Lax Kw’aalams First Nation, and Metlakatla First Nation. The EAO invited all these

First Nations to participate in the assessment of this Amendment. All seven First Nations elected to participate as participating Indigenous nations, and the EAO offered these nations capacity funding to support their engagement. For more information, see Section 4.0 of this Report.

On November 4, 2026, the EAO issued the [amendment procedures](#) to Cedar which consisted of the following key steps:

- Consultation with participating Indigenous nations;
- Public engagement activities;
- Technical review of the Amendment Application by the EAO, participating Indigenous nations, and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)¹ members;
- Issues resolution between the EAO, participating Indigenous nations, TAC members and Cedar; and
- Review of the Amendment Assessment Report and Amendment Order drafts by participating Indigenous nations, TAC members, IAAC and Cedar.

[Section 25](#) of the Act sets out the required assessment matters that must be considered for amendments. However, the scope of the proposed amendment was determined by the EAO to have the potential to affect the following valued components² and assessment matters:

- Air quality
- Acoustics
- Vegetation resources
- Freshwater fish
- Human health
- Infrastructure and services
- Human and community well-being

The EAO established a TAC to assist with the EAO's review of the Amendment Application, which included the following participating Indigenous nations, Local Governments, and provincial and federal government agencies:

Participating Indigenous Nations:

- Haisla Nation;
- Metlakatla First Nation;
- Kitselas First Nation;
- Kitsumkalum First Nation;
- Lax Kw'alaams Band;
- Gitga'at First Nation; and

Provincial Ministries and Agencies:

- Ministry of Energy and Climate Solutions;
- Ministry of Environment and Parks;
- Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs;
- Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation; and
- British Columbia Energy Regulator.

¹ Technical advisors who that have relevant expertise for this amendment.

² Valued components are components of the biophysical and human environment that are considered by the public, First Nations, the proponent, government agencies, or scientists and other technical specialists involved in the environmental assessment process to have scientific, ecological, economic, social, cultural, archeological, historical, or other importance.

- Gitxaala Nation.

Local Governments and Health Authorities:

- District of Kitimat;
- Regional District of Kitimat – Stikine; and
- Northern Health.

Federal Authorities:

- Canadian Coast Guard;
- Environment and Climate Change Canada;
- Health Canada; and
- Women and Gender Equality Canada.

The issues raised by the TAC and associated outcomes are outlined in [Section 6](#) of this Report.

During the amendment assessment process, the EAO advised IAAC of issues that potentially related to matters under federal jurisdiction or covered by the Cedar LNG federal Decision Statement. The EAO understands that IAAC will review comments from the TAC, including comments from participating Indigenous nations, and the EAO's Assessment Report to support their decision making on amending the federal Decision Statement.

4.0 FIRST NATION ENGAGEMENT

During development of the Amendment Application, the Holder engaged with the following First Nations on the proposed amendment: Haisla Nation, Kitselas First Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Gitga'at First Nation, Gitxaala Nation, Metlakatla First Nation, Lax, Kw'alaams Band, Métis Nation British Columbia, and Haida Nation. Cedar engaged with First Nations to discuss the proposed amendment and shared the air quality modelling results supporting the amendment prior to submission.

[Section 25\(1\)](#) of the Act requires an assessment of the effects of the proposed project changes on Indigenous nations and their Section 35 Rights under the *Constitution Act, 1982*. The EAO began consultation on the Amendment Application with participating Indigenous nations in September 2025 and sought to achieve consensus with participating Indigenous nations on the proposed amendment, pursuant to [Section 32\(7\)](#) of the Act. Over the course of the amendment process, the EAO sought feedback on the Amendment Application, draft Amendment Assessment Report and amended Certificate. Haisla Nation, Kitselas First Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Gitga'at First Nation, Gitxaala Nation, and Metlakatla First Nation provided comments related to the proposed amendments which Cedar responded to over two rounds of technical review. Many of the participating Indigenous nations shared concerns on similar topics including, air quality emissions contribution to airshed cumulative effects, air quality deposition effects to vegetation and freshwater systems in receiving environment, human health, effectiveness of airshed monitoring programs and worker health and safety. The participating Indigenous nations comments and Cedar's responses are considered in Section 6 (Summary of Key Issues and Effects of the Amendment) and all comments and responses are published in the [Issues Tracking Table](#).

5.0 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The EAO did not establish a Community Advisory Committee for the proposed amendment. Community Advisory Committees may be established on a discretionary, project-specific basis. The EAO determined that the scope of the amendment warranted public engagement to support community members in providing feedback on the proposed changes.

The EAO held a Public Comment Period on the Amendment Application from November 3, 2025, to December 3, 2025. Public respondents completed a total of 15 surveys which are available at [EPIC Engage](#). Cedar prepared a [Public Consultation Report](#) to respond to comments on the Amendment Application, and a summary of engagement that described Cedar's public and community engagement on the Amendment Application. Cedar's community engagement included an open house in each of Kitimaat Village and Kitimat as well as Cedar's participation in a Kitimat Airshed Group open house.

During the 30-day public comment period, members of the public raised concerns about the effects of increased noise and emissions and greenhouse gas on community well-being, human health, marine resources, vegetation, wildlife, and ecosystem health. Commenters also raised concerns regarding uncertainty due to outdated, incomplete, or missing baseline data and cumulative effects analysis. Effects to Indigenous rights, governance, and social effects were also raised, including impacts to traditional use, cultural continuity, consultation, transparency, and community cohesion.

6.0 SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND EFFECTS OF THE AMENDMENT

Cedar assessed the effects of the proposed amendment on the valued components considered during the Environmental Assessment, including air quality, acoustics, vegetation resources, freshwater fish, and human health.

In the Amendment Application, Cedar reviewed potential effects to First Nations and their interests and concluded that the proposed amendment would not affect asserted or established Indigenous interests or Treaty rights beyond what was assessed in the Environmental Assessment Application.

During the amendment process, the EAO coordinated two rounds of technical review. The EAO also facilitated TAC meetings where Cedar LNG presented on air quality modelling related to increased LNG production capacity and worker accommodation for the FLNG facility.

The full list of comments made by the TAC and responses by Cedar LNG are detailed in the final [Issues Tracking Table](#).

The central issues identified by the TAC and participating Indigenous nations were cumulative effects to air quality from cumulative air emission contributions to the receiving environment and associated human health effects, including that of the workers based on the FLNG. The District of Kitimat also raised concerns about potential loss of economic benefits from off-duty workers not residing in the community.

6.1. Air Quality

6.1.1. Background

Cedar LNG is located in an airshed that experiences air emissions from community sources such as transportation activities and home heating, as well as open burning of forestry waste, and industrial sources. The largest industrial sources of air emissions are the Rio Tinto Aluminum Smelter and LNG Canada and its associated marine shipping activities.

The Environmental Assessment of Cedar LNG considered how project emissions from marine and land-based activities, including construction, liquefaction of natural gas, transportation activities and LNG loading would affect ambient air quality. The Amendment Application only considers the incremental change in emissions from the proposed increase in liquefaction capacity, as all other project activities are remaining the same as previously considered in the Environmental Assessment.

Ambient air quality is characterized as the quality of outdoor air and is measured by the concentrations of contaminants in the air. The criteria air contaminants (CACs) evaluated in the Environmental Assessment and the Amendment Application are:

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂);
- Sulphur dioxide (SO₂);
- Carbon monoxide (CO); and
- Fine particulate matter (PM) with a diameter of less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}).

The Amendment Application also considered the incremental contribution to air emission deposition rates of nitrogen (N), sulphur (S), and the combination of N and S. The deposition of S and N compounds from air emissions may potentially impact vegetation and lead to freshwater acidification (lowered pH levels, potentially affecting aquatic organisms) and eutrophication (increased nutrient levels, potentially leading to changes in algal communities and decreased aquatic oxygen levels).

The Amendment Application expanded the spatial boundary of the regional assessment area beyond what was used in the Environmental Assessment to capture the effects of existing emission sources near the Project, to align with other recent assessments in the airshed, and to support preparation of the Project's application for a waste discharge authorization.

6.1.2. Holder's Assessment

The increase in production capacity would result in an incremental increase in NO_x, SO₂, PM_{2.5}, and CO emissions compared to the modelling results presented in the Environmental Assessment. Cedar assessed air quality using dispersion modelling that evaluated the project's incremental contributions using a Base Case (existing conditions) and an Application Case (existing conditions plus project emissions). The modelling incorporated emissions from Cedar LNG alongside existing regional sources and baseline ambient concentrations to characterize both project specific and cumulative air quality conditions. Specifically, for the Application Case, Cedar reports maximum 1-hour increases from the Project of 9.5% for NO₂, 0.1% for SO₂, 0.0% for PM_{2.5}, and 0% for CO compared to the Base Case.

The modelling results indicated that while concentrations of SO₂ and PM_{2.5} are expected to exceed the B.C. AQO thresholds at certain locations across the airshed in both Base Case and Application Case scenarios, these exceedances are primarily driven by existing industrial emission sources and background conditions, rather than the incremental contribution from Cedar LNG. Cedar LNG's contribution to these exceedances is characterized as minor and localized, with the highest incremental increases occurring in proximity to the FLNG facility and within the local assessment area. The assessment indicated that predicted NO₂ concentrations increases are spatially limited and generally remain below AQOs, while CO concentrations remain well below applicable thresholds. Cedar concluded that the emissions from the proposed increase in liquefaction capacity do not materially change the spatial extent, frequency or magnitude of air quality or cumulative effects as found in the original Environmental Assessment.

6.1.3. Key Concerns Raised

Kitselas First Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Gitxaala Nation, Gitga'at First Nation, Metlakatla First Nation, Health Canada, Ministry of Environment and Parks, and Ministry of Energy and Climate Solutions raised concerns regarding cumulative air quality effects in the Kitimat airshed, noting that pollution levels are already high and have exceeded acceptable levels at times. Gitga'at First Nation expressed that Nation members are already experiencing effects of an industrialized airshed and have reported observation of smoke plumes from the Rio Tinto aluminium smelter. These reviewers questioned the characterization of Project effects as "incremental" or "negligible." Concerns were also raised regarding dispersion modelling assumptions, including treatment of flaring and scenario definitions, and the reliance on existing regional monitoring programs. Reviewers identified a need for project-specific monitoring and clearer adaptive management triggers in the event of exceedances in the Kitimat region. Gitxaala Nation raised concerns about greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed increase in liquefaction capacity. Cedar responded that the increase in liquefaction is attributed to efficiencies and no additional greenhouse gas emissions are expected.

Additionally, Health Canada, Ministry of Energy and Climate Solutions, Northern Health, Gitga'at First Nation and Gitxaala Nation raised concerns about flaring, including whether emissions from commissioning and upset conditions are underestimated, whether worst case scenarios are adequately assessed and whether these events could contribute to short-term exceedances and cumulative air quality effects. These reviewers also emphasized the need for monitoring, and clear management responses related to flaring events.

6.1.4. Mitigation and Follow-up

Cedar did not propose new mitigation measures for the amendment and indicated that existing measures remain sufficient and would apply to the scope of the requested amendment, including electrification of the facility, standard emission controls, regulatory compliance, and participation in regional monitoring initiatives, including Kitimat Airshed Group. If the amendment is granted, Cedar would be required to make an application to the BCER for an *Environmental Management Act* waste discharge authorization and implement continuous emissions monitoring for the FLNG facility. The waste discharge authorization may include facility-specific requirements such as emission limits, monitoring requirements, and reporting obligations.

6.1.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

While the Project's contribution to air quality is expected to be small relative to existing sources, the EAO acknowledges that Cedar LNG would contribute to cumulative air quality effects in an already industrialized airshed where exceedances of applicable criteria may occur.

The EAO considered the responses provided by Cedar regarding the dispersion modelling assumptions and the distinction between the effects of Cedar LNG potential emissions and the emissions by existing sources in the region. The EAO also considered the potential subsequent permitting requirements by BCER (waste discharge authorization) as well as existing regional airshed monitoring initiatives, including Cedar's participation in the Kitimat Airshed Group, required by Certificate Condition 16 (Regional Cumulative Effects Initiative).

The EAO considered Cedar LNG's worst-case flaring scenarios as part of a dedicated "flaring case" using conservative assumptions. The EAO also considered that the most intensive flaring occurs during controlled start up and overall effects are smaller relative to other emission sources.

In addition to the existing mitigations and permits, the EAO proposed updates to Certificate Condition 16 to require the Holder to participate in any regional air quality and deposition monitoring programs for the Kitimat Airshed established by the Province, as well as the Kitimat Airshed Group. The EAO concludes that although the Cedar amendment would incrementally contribute to air quality emissions, it would not result in significant adverse residual or cumulative effects on the air quality valued component.

6.2. Human Health

6.2.1. Background

The Environmental Assessment of Cedar LNG considered the potential for project-related changes in the environment that could affect the health of workers, Indigenous communities and the public through multiple exposure pathways, including inhalation of contaminants, ingestion of potentially contaminated country foods, water, or marine resources, dermal contact with contaminated mediums, and sensory disturbance pathways such as exposure to noise, lighting, and visual changes.

The Amendment Application assessed impacts to human health related to the scope of the proposed incremental changes associated with air emissions, noise, and housing workers closer to air emissions and noise sources at the FLNG facility. The Amendment Application relies on findings of technical assessments, including air quality and acoustics, to evaluate whether incremental changes in emissions or operational conditions would affect human health. The Amendment Application specifically considers incremental changes in CACs, specifically NO₂, SO₂, CO and PM_{2.5}, as a result of proposed increase in liquefaction capacity. Cedar also assessed changes in sulphur and nitrogen deposition, which may contribute to freshwater acidification and eutrophication and indirectly affect ecological and human receptors.

6.2.2. Holder's Assessment

Cedar assessed human health effects by evaluating exposure to air emissions and noise for nearby receptors, including workers accommodated on the FLNG, using the Application Case (existing conditions plus project emissions) to represent operational conditions. The assessment compared predicted pollutant concentrations and noise levels to applicable health-based guidelines. Cedar's assessment indicated that while overall noise levels are not materially changed from those assessed in the original Environmental Assessment, the addition of worker accommodation on the FLNG introduces a new exposure scenario. Cedar predicted that workers may experience higher exposure to air pollutants and continuous operational noise; however, Cedar characterized exposure to air contaminants as low, given the incremental increase of air emissions related to the Project in comparison with the baseline is small. Indoor noise levels within the accommodation block are expected to meet International Maritime Organization (IMO) Code on Noise Levels on Board Ships (IMO 2012), although external noise generated by facility operations may exceed Health Canada sleep disturbance thresholds. Cedar indicated that building design and insulation would reduce noise levels within accommodation units to acceptable levels. Cedar concluded that these conditions would not result in adverse health effects for workers, and that overall health risk would remain negligible.

6.2.3. Key Concerns Raised

Health Canada, Gitxaala Nation, and Kitsumkalum First Nation raised concerns regarding the assessment of human health effects in the context of existing air quality conditions in the Kitimat airshed. Reviewers identified the need for project-specific monitoring and adaptive management, including monitoring of flaring and conditions on the FLNG accommodation block. Health Canada, Northern Health, and Gitxaala Nation raised concerns regarding predicted exceedances of health-based guidelines for SO₂, NO₂, and PM_{2.5}, particularly for workers accommodated on the FLNG in close proximity to emission sources. Reviewers also voiced their concerns around the characterisation of risks for non-threshold pollutants and raised concerns regarding cumulative effects of multiple pollutants on human health, the treatment of reversibility of health effects, and the lack of long-term health monitoring or consideration of broader health outcomes for workers and nearby populations.

Gitxaala Nation and Northern Health also raised concerns regarding noise exposure within worker accommodation cabins on the FLNG, including the potential for sleep disturbance due to continuous or variable noise levels. Reviewers noted that sleep disruption during off-duty periods may lead to fatigue and have implications for worker health and safety during on-duty operations.

6.2.4. Mitigation and Follow-up

To mitigate potential health effects from air emissions, Cedar is relying on existing mitigation measures, including facility electrification, standard emission controls, and compliance with BCER permitting requirements. Cedar stated that air quality and human health effects will be further managed through the waste discharge authorization process, which is expected to include emissions limits, monitoring, and adaptive management requirements. Cedar noted that noise disturbance for workers would be mitigated through design of the FLNG and accommodation units, including use of enclosed cabins with sound insulation and layout considerations to reduce noise exposures.

Follow-up is primarily proposed through participation in regional airshed monitoring programs and implementation of permitting conditions under the BCER waste discharge authorization.

6.2.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

To address concerns about health and medical services, the EAO is proposing updates to Certificate Condition 13 (Health and Medical Services Plan) to require the Holder to ensure on duty and off duty workers on board of the FLNG have access to timely health and medical services. To address concerns about cumulative effects in the Kitimat airshed, the EAO is proposing to update Certificate Condition 16 to require Cedar to participate in any regional air quality and

deposition monitoring program in the Kitimat airshed established by the Province. Additionally, the EAO is proposing a new Certificate condition 18 (Accommodation Block Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Plan) to require the Holder to monitor air quality and noise levels during commissioning and first year of operations at the FLNG to ensure air emissions and noise levels do not result in adverse health effects for the off-duty workers occupying the FLNG. The EAO considered the concerns raised by TAC members and concludes that with the application of existing requirements by provincial and federal conditions, BCER waste discharge authorization requirements and the EAO's proposed updates to Certificate conditions, there would be no significant adverse effects to human health.

6.3. Acoustics

6.3.1. Background

In the Environmental Assessment, the acoustics valued component was assessed to evaluate the potential for project-related noise and vibration effects on local and Indigenous communities, Project workers, wildlife and other sensitive receptors within the local and regional assessment area. The Environmental Assessment considered changes to the existing acoustic environment during construction and operations. The assessment identified road traffic, industrial activities, marine shipping and natural environment sounds as key contributors to the existing acoustic environment.

The Environmental Assessment evaluated potential effects from both airborne noise and vibration generated by land-based construction activities, operation of the FLNG facility, supporting infrastructure, marine vessel traffic, and LNG carriers. The assessment considered potential effects to noise-sensitive receptors, including nearby residences, campsites, marine users, and culturally important areas identified by First Nations. Potential effects were evaluated through comparison of predicted sound levels against applicable acoustic criteria and Health Canada guidance for community noise, including indicators related to sleep disturbance and community annoyance. The assessment also considered cumulative acoustics effects in combination with existing and reasonably foreseeable activities in the region.

With the proposed increase in liquefaction capacity and the accommodation of up to 80 workers on the FLNG facility, the acoustic effects would differ from what was previously assessed during the Environmental Assessment. However, Cedar expects the changes to be incremental, as project activities and noise sources remain generally consistent with those previously assessed, with the increased liquefaction capacity driving the primary acoustic changes. Similar to the original Environmental Assessment, the amendment assessment considered potential operational noise effects on nearby-sensitive receptors and evaluated predicted sound levels against applicable acoustic and health-based guidance.

6.3.2. Holder's Assessment

Cedar assessed the acoustic effects using an updated noise modelling that considered existing conditions and Project-related noise under the amendment with worker accommodation on the FLNG as a new receptor. Results of the model indicated that predicted noise levels remain below applicable guidelines at onshore receptors, including Kitimaat Village. For the workers accommodation units on the FLNG, Cedar predicted that noise levels would remain below applicable occupational and sleep disturbance thresholds, including those set by the Canadian Labour Code Maritime Occupational Health and Safety Regulations and the IMO Code on Noise Levels on Board Ships (IMO 2012).

Cedar concluded that the characterization of acoustic effects would remain unchanged.

6.3.3. Key Concerns Raised

The only concerns raised about the acoustics environment due to the proposed changes were focused on the effects of housing up to 80 workers on the FLNG.

6.3.4. Mitigation and Follow-up

Cedar is not proposing new mitigation measures for effects to noise levels. Cedar would be subject to BCER's LNG facility permits requiring the Holder to consider the effects of noise in engineering design.

6.3.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

The EAO considered the Amendment Application, comments from the TAC and existing mitigations measures and subsequent permitting requirements and concludes that the proposed amendments would not have significant adverse effects on acoustics valued component. The EAO acknowledges that housing 80 workers on the FLNG facility would increase the exposure of workers to noise disturbances, which would be mitigated through Certificate Condition 18 (Accommodation Block Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Plan) to monitor and mitigate noise disturbances for off-duty workers on the accommodation Block.

6.4. Human and Community Well-Being

6.4.1. Background

The Environmental Assessment evaluated Project-related social, economic, cultural and health effects on human and community well-being. The assessment included potential effects on vulnerable populations, including women, Indigenous women and girls, youth, and low-income households. Cedar considered how temporary workforce influxes and rotational workforces may disproportionately affect these vulnerable populations. Cedar identified mitigation measures included workforce conduct, cultural awareness training, community engagement, emergency response coordination, and monitoring of community well-being indicators.

To address the potential effects from the Project on vulnerable populations, the Certificate included requirements under Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) for incorporation of policies and training for a workplace code of ethics, cultural sensitivity, drug and alcohol use, respectful workplace, and workplace violence (including gender-based violence) and gender equity and diversity employment measures and practices.

Cedar's proposal in the Amendment Application to move up to 80 workers to the FLNG facility creating a work-camp scenario would potentially alter the human and community well-being effects previously assessed and is considered by the EAO as a matter for consideration for potential effects under Section 25(2)(d) of the Act.

6.4.2. Holder's Assessment

Although the assessment of human and community well-being effects was not included in the Amendment Application, Cedar considered that introducing worker accommodation on the FLNG may have a potential disproportionate effect on distinct human populations, including human populations identified by gender.

The Amendment Application considered how the proposed changes would interact with Indigenous interests, including assessing effects on affected populations. Cedar determined that because the Project is located within Haisla Nation territory, the specific assessment of effects to Indigenous nations included only Haisla Nation and excluded other First Nations who were consulted in the Environmental Assessment, including Kitselas First Nation, Gitxaala Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Gitga'at First Nation, Lax Kw'alaams Band, Metlakatla First Nation, Metis Nation British Columbia and the Haida Nation. With the context of worker accommodation on the FLNG, Cedar concluded that there would be no change in potential residual effects to Haisla Nation Indigenous health and well-being, or any particularly affected populations that include women, Indigenous women and other vulnerable groups.

6.4.3. Key Concerns Raised

Gitxaala Nation and Women and Gender Equality Canada raised concerns regarding worker health and wellbeing, including potential mental health effects, communicable disease risks, and the safety of accommodating a mixed

workforce on the FLNG. Reviewers noted the lack of detail regarding mitigation measures to support worker wellbeing, including protections for vulnerable groups such as Indigenous women.

6.4.4. Mitigation and Follow-up

Cedar relied on existing mitigation measures, including policies and training related to cultural sensitivity, workplace code of ethics, and workplace violence, required under provincial and federal conditions, to address potential effects to health and community well-being.

6.4.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

Although Cedar did not identify human and community well-being as an assessment matter that would be affected by the proposed amendment, the EAO views that a mixed-gender FLNG accommodation block may introduce potential effects to vulnerable populations within the operational workforce. To address potential effects to vulnerable populations due to the FLNG accommodation block, the EAO proposes updates to Certificate Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) to require Cedar to include a Gender-Based Violence Response Program that would include a reporting system for workers on the FLNG to report complaints of sexual exploitation, abuse, harassment and gender-based violence associated with the Project. The EAO considered the Amendment Application, comments received from the TAC, and proposed updates to Certificate Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) and concludes that the effects to human and community well-being due to the proposed amendment would not be significant.

6.5. Infrastructure and Services

6.5.1. Background

In the Environmental Assessment, Cedar did not include a work camp as part of the project during the Operation phase. The approximately 100 workers assessed in the Environmental Assessment were anticipated to be housed in existing work camps or other temporary accommodations in the District of Kitimat (DoK). However, the potential demands of the Cedar LNG workforce on local accommodation were included in the assessment of effects on the infrastructure and services valued component. The EAO concluded in the Environmental Assessment that the Project would result in a residual adverse effect to the infrastructure and services valued component due to the potential of workers utilizing local housing stock and reducing accommodation availability. To mitigate this effect the Certificate includes the development of an accommodation policy under Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) to reduce Project workers ability to rent local housing.

6.5.2. Holders Assessment

For the proposed amendment, Cedar stated that providing housing for up to 80 workers on the FLNG, out of the approximately 100 operational workers assessed during the Environmental Assessment, would reduce the demand on hotels and local accommodation facilities and reduce the volume of daily traffic travelling to and from the project. As a result, Cedar excluded the infrastructure and services valued component from assessment of potential effects in the Amendment Application.

6.5.3. Key Concerns Raised

The DoK commented that it would be a benefit to the community of Kitimat to have the Cedar workers utilize existing housing stock and services, rather than having them reside on the FLNG. On June 15, 2026, DoK passed a bylaw amendment to align Cedar LNG's boundary with the District of Kitimat's zoning and Industrial land use designation, as portions of the FLNG were located outside the existing zoning and official community plan boundaries. Although the purpose of this rezoning is to ensure that the entire Project is encompassed within the district's industrial zoning, it may have implications for the proposed accommodation of workers on the FLNG. In response, Cedar emphasised that the proposal to have workers living on the FLNG is to optimize the safe and efficient operation of the Project. Cedar also

committed to maximizing the participation of local workers in the Project and to working with the DoK to support the permanent relocation of more workers to the community as operations progress.

6.5.4. Mitigation and Follow-up

Cedar relies on existing mitigation measures, provincial and federal conditions to address potential effects to the infrastructure and services valued component including negative effects of reducing local housing availability. Cedar concluded for the Amendment Application that effects to the infrastructure and services valued component would be negligible with implementation of existing provincial Certificate and federal Decision Statement requirements.

6.5.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

Although Cedar did not identify infrastructure and services as a valued component potentially affected by the proposed amendment, the EAO under Section 25 of the Act, considered the potential effects related to Project workers being accommodated on the FLNG rather than being housed in the District of Kitimat. If the amendment is approved, Cedar would be authorized to accommodate up to 80 workers on the FLNG but would not be obligated to do so under the Certificate, thereby providing Cedar flexibility to determine future accommodation strategies for project workers, in consultation with local communities including the DoK.

The EAO acknowledges the potential loss of economic benefits from workers being accommodated in the community, and that there are future potential opportunities for Cedar to support accommodation of workers in the community of Kitimat. However, the EAO has also considered the benefit of workers living on the FLNG resulting in a decrease in overall demand on community services and mitigating pressure on local housing availability. The EAO also views the proposed accommodation of workers on the FLNG as consistent with the current Certificate requirements for workers to live in work camps and avoid rental of local housing during project construction.

The EAO considered the Amendment Application, comments received from the TAC, and existing Certificate Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) and the federal Decision statement and concluded that the effects to infrastructure and services from the proposed amendment would not be significant.

6.6. Effects to First Nations

6.6.1. Background

In the original environmental assessment, the EAO considered the potential effects of Cedar LNG on the asserted or established First Nations' rights and title recognized and affirmed by Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, as well as Indigenous Interests. The assessment considered effects on Indigenous Interests alongside the assessment of biophysical, social, economic, heritage and health valued components, recognizing that changes to these valued components may influence the exercise of Indigenous rights and interests. The EAO considered Indigenous Interests related to harvesting, use of culturally important sites, Indigenous governance, health and well-being, sense of place, and cultural identity, among other nation specific interests identified during the environmental assessment.

The proposed amendment would not alter the project footprint, marine shipping route or number of LNG carriers, or construction methods outside those previously assessed. Accordingly, the assessment of this Amendment focused on whether changes to environmental and socio-economic effects associated with the Amendment could result in changes to the potential effects on Indigenous interests.

6.6.2. Holder's Assessment

Cedar assessed the potential effects of the amendment on Indigenous Interests and concluded that the incremental increase in air emissions associated with the proposed increase in liquefaction capacity and accommodating up to 80 Workers on the FLNG would not result in new or materially different effects from those assessed during the original environmental assessment. Cedar concluded that the amendment would not change the Project footprint, marine

activities, or other primary pathways through which Indigenous Interests were previously assessed. Cedar engaged with all participating Indigenous nations during the amendment assessment process. Given that Cedar LNG is located on Haisla Nation-owned fee simple lands and does not alter the Project footprint or marine shipping activities, Cedar's assessment of Indigenous Interests focused primarily on potential effects to Haisla Nation.

6.6.3. Key Issues Raised

During the Amendment Assessment, all participating Indigenous nations raised concerns about the potential incremental increase in air emissions and its contribution to the Kitimat airshed, in particular the potential contribution of Cedar LNG to regional emissions in combination with existing and reasonably foreseeable projects.

Several participating Indigenous nations raised concerns regarding the potential effects of increased air emissions on human health and the receiving environment. These concerns included potential effects on country foods, vegetation, freshwater ecosystems and the broader environment that support the exercise of Indigenous Interests. Participating Indigenous nations requested continued monitoring and reporting to verify the predictions of the air quality assessment and to inform adaptive management should monitoring identify greater than predicted effects.

Participating Indigenous nations also voiced concerns regarding potential effects on human and community well-being associated with accommodating operations workers on the FLNG facility. Participating Indigenous nations sought assurance that appropriate health services, worker supports, and measures to address gender-based violence and the protection of vulnerable populations, including Indigenous women and girls, would continue to be implemented throughout Project operations.

6.6.4. Mitigation and Follow up

Cedar relied on the existing environmental management and monitoring framework, including mitigation measures related to air quality, human health, socioeconomic effects, and environmental monitoring as it concluded that the proposed amendment would not introduce new pathways of effects on Indigenous Interests beyond those assessed during the original environmental assessment. As a result, Cedar determined that the mitigation measures and management plans established through the original environmental assessment would remain applicable. Cedar would also be required to implement permitting conditions under the BCER waste discharge authorization.

6.6.5. EAO's Assessment of Effects

The EAO considered Cedar's assessment, and comments received from participating Indigenous nations. The EAO considered the potential effects of the amendment on all participating Indigenous nations. Although the Project footprint remains unchanged, potential pathways such as regional air quality, cumulative effects of increased emissions in the Kitimat airshed, human health and community well-being may extend beyond the immediate Project area and may be relevant to multiple participating Indigenous nations.

The EAO considered the potential effects of increased air emissions and associated human health and cumulative air quality effects through the relevant valued components in this Report which informed the EAO's assessment of effects to Indigenous interests. The EAO also identified that accommodating operations workers on the FLNG facility has the potential to influence human and community well-being and infrastructure and services differently than previously assessed. Accordingly, the EAO undertook additional assessment of these matters and recommends amendments to Certificate Conditions 13 (Health and Medical Services Plan), 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan), 16 (Regional Cumulative Effects Initiative), and the addition of new Condition 18 (Accommodation Block Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Plan). The EAO is satisfied that the amendment does not introduce new adverse pathways of effects on Indigenous Interests beyond those previously assessed and that the proposed Certificate Conditions provide appropriate mechanisms to monitor and manage the incremental effects associated with the amendment.

Though the EAO sought consensus, outstanding concerns remained regarding cumulative effects to air quality. As described above, the EAO has proposed amendments to conditions and a new condition to mitigate effects of the proposed Cedar LNG amendment. For the purposes of this amendment the EAO is of the view that it has fulfilled its statutory and constitutional obligations owed to participating Indigenous nations related to the issuance of this amendment to the Certificate within the scope of the Act.

7.0 PROPOSED CERTIFICATE CHANGES AND AMENDMENT CONDITIONS

In consideration of the concerns raised by the participants in the Amendment process, the EAO proposes to add one new condition and update, rescind and replace one condition, and update four existing conditions in the Certificate:

- A new Certificate Condition 18 (Accommodation Block Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Plan) to require the Holder to monitor air quality and noise in the Accommodation Block;
- Update to Certificate Condition 2 (Document Updates) to include new Certificate condition 18;
- Update to Certificate Condition 3 (Document Development) to include new Certificate condition 18;
- Update to Certificate Condition 14 (Socioeconomic Management Plan) to include a gender-based violence response program for workers housed in the Accommodation Block;
- Update to Certificate Condition 16 (Regional Cumulative Effects Initiative) to include participation in the Kitimat Airshed Group and any regional air quality and deposition monitoring programs established by the Province; and
- Replacing Certificate Condition 13 (Health and Medical Services Plan) with more detailed requirements in response to Cedar's proposed plan to house up to 80 workers in the Accommodation Block.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

The EAO's view is that the issues and concerns raised by the TAC members, including participating Indigenous nations, have been addressed through the amendment review process and by the EAO's proposed conditions and changes to the Certificate. Given the limited scope of the Amendment Application and potential for proposed amendment effects, the EAO concludes that there would be no significant adverse effects to [Section 25](#) matters as a result of the proposed amendment. The EAO also concludes that there would be no change from the conclusions of the original Environmental Assessment to any of the valued components and Indigenous interests that were assessed as part of the Amendment Application.

Based on the EAO's review and analysis of the information contained in the Amendment Application, the consultation with participating Indigenous nations, comments and issue resolution with the TAC, and the requirements in the Certificate and subsequent permitting processes, the EAO is satisfied that:

- The Amendment Application and supporting information adequately identified and assessed the potential positive and negative adverse changes to the environmental, economic, social, cultural and health effects of the Cedar LNG resulting from the proposed amendment;
- The matters described in [Section 25\(2\)](#) of the Act have been considered and the proposed amendment is unlikely to result in new or additional effects on these matters considered in the original Environmental Assessment, except as described in this Report;
- Existing monitoring and mitigation requirements required in the Certificate, in combination with the proposed amendments to Schedule B Table of Conditions, are adequate to manage the effects identified;
- The effects of the amendment on participating Indigenous nations as described in [Section 25\(1\)](#) of the Act have been appropriately assessed and have been addressed to the satisfaction of the EAO;

- Efforts to seek consensus on the concerns that participating Indigenous nations raised with the Application and these conclusions were undertaken, with consideration given to the purpose of the EAO to support reconciliation with Indigenous peoples in B.C. as set out in [Section 2\(2\)\(b\)\(ii\)](#) of the Act; and
- The EAO has fulfilled its statutory and constitutional obligations owed to participating Indigenous nations relating to the issuance of an amendment to the Certificate.

The EAO recommends that the Deputy Chief Executive Assessment Officer, upon consideration of the conclusions in this Report and any other relevant factors, issue an Amendment under [Section 32](#) of the Act to allow the requested amendment of the Certificate for Cedar LNG, including proposed changes to the Schedule A Certified Project Description and Schedule B Table of Conditions.