

Canaport LNG Project

Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 33
Monday, 14 May 2007
Red Head United Church Hall, Saint John, N.B.
Meeting 6:05pm - 9:30pm

Approved as Amended

Committee Present:

- Armstrong, Carol Resident
- Armstrong, Stu Co-chair of CCELC, Resident
- Brown, Alice Resident
- Dalzell, Gordon SJ Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
- Debly, Teresa Resident
- Forsythe, Fraser Co-Chair (Canaport LNG)
- Griffin, Dennis Resident
- Griffin, Glenn Resident
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- Malcharek, Rainer Bayside Power
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- Perry, Yvonne Resident
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Sherman, Peter Resident
- Smith, Elsie Resident
- Thompson, David Member
- Thompson, Jean Resident

Committee Absent:

- Bruce, Patrick Member
- Court, Ivan City of Saint John Councilor
- Lyttle, Dwain Resident
- Melvin, Keith Enterprise Saint John
- Quinn, Kevin Bay Pilots & Marine Consultants
- Roy, Beth Resident
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade

Resources:

- Alexander, Matt Fundy Engineering
- Boilard, Pierre SNC CENMC

- Hogsden, Kristy Fundy Engineering
- Forsythe, Joel Fundy Engineering
- Van der Veen, Carolyn Canaport LNG
- Walter, Carolyn NBDENV

Opening Remarks:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 pm with Fraser Forsythe opening the meeting and welcoming all returning members and resource attendees. Matt Alexander was welcomed to the meeting and will answer questions about the Secondary Egress Road EIA. Fraser Forsythe indicated that Terry Totten from the City of Saint John may attend to discuss Action Items from the 16 April 2007 meeting.

Review & Approval of minutes from March 19th meeting:

The minutes of meeting #32 16 April 2007, were revised to include the following changes:

- *Answer 39 (page 11) was revised to indicate that complaints were received from workers and contractors on the quality of concrete.*

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

Kathy Rogers inquired if all presentations listed on the agenda would be made tonight. Fraser Forsythe indicated that all presenters were expected to attend.

Report on Action Items from April 16th meeting:

32-1: Fraser Forsythe spoke to Mark Duguay (Irving Oil) and a sign will be erected outside the Canaport LNG gate to direct traffic to use RHSAR.

32-2: Fraser Forsythe noted that Ivan Court was not present to speak to the request of a City of Saint John spokesperson presenting a 7-year capital plan for Red Head Road.

32-3: A letter was sent to Terry Totten requesting a redesign of RHSAR intersection with Red Head Road to a T-intersection and requesting a spokesperson from the City of Saint John to speak to the 7-year plan for Red Head Road. Fraser Forsythe also stated that he spoke with Terry Totten and that he indicated he would attend tonight’s meeting.

Stu Armstrong brought forward a newspaper article regarding a meeting at the Red Head United Church on 16 May 2006 from 2:00 – 4:00 pm and 6:00 – 8:00 pm which will address planned road and sewer work on Red Head Road. Fraser

Forsythe added that information provided at this meeting may be related to the City of Saint John's 7-year capital plan for Red Head Road.

32-4: A letter was sent to Terry Totten requesting that a City of Saint John employee be appointed to the CCELC as a permanent resource member.

Kathy Rogers asked if any feedback had been received regarding the letter. Fraser Forsythe responded that he had spoken with Terry Totten and that Jim Baird had been suggested as the potential member.

32-5: Fraser Forsythe has explored possibilities into providing a meaningful response to the request for property assessment. He also added that the EIA document describes the project as having no impact on real estate value in the area.

Q1. (David Thompson) How do you make this determination?

A1. (Fraser Forsythe) This statement was based on the following four criteria: 1) Public Health and safety risks – None because the facility meets Canadian standards; 2) Traffic Levels – No substantial increase during operation but there is an acknowledged increase during construction; 3) Insurance Rates – These will be unaffected based on a State Farm insurance analysis done for the Lake Charles Louisiana LNG facility; 4) Visual Impacts – Minimal visual impacts because of the treed buffer along Red Head Road in vicinity of Project.

Q2. (David Thompson) What about people moving to and investing money in the Red Head area?

Peter Sherman noted that the assessment does not consider the effects of the Eider Rock project. David Thompson further indicated that the assessment does not assess property values during the construction phase and fails to address the deteriorated condition of the Red Head Road, which has basically become a trucking route. Peter Sherman inquired about the combined effect that the proposed refinery will have on real estate values. Fraser Forsythe responded that the EIA was done for the Canaport LNG facility only and a potential effect could arise with the refinery. Gordon Dalzell stated a validation study is needed to verify the accuracy of EIA statements and that this can be built into the Approval to Operate. Fraser Forsythe acknowledged the deteriorating condition of the infrastructure and noted that some of these issues will be addressed in the City's 7-year Capital Plan. Peter Sherman reiterated that a follow-up audit should be done to validate the EIA statements.

Q3. (David Thompson) Does the EIA assess property values after the construction of the LNG terminal?

A3. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes, an EIA looks at a pre-determined number of Valued Ecological Components (VECs) and assesses a project's impact on these VECs for the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the project.

Q4. (David Thompson) What would the assessment indicate my property value would be right now with all of the construction activity and noises?

A4. (Fraser Forsythe) The property value assessment looks at the long term effects of the Project.

Glen Griffin indicated he is concerned about atmospheric and light pollution and tanker traffic from the facility which reduce the quality of life in the area. Fraser Forsythe commented that the lights are necessary for security and that tanker traffic will be as described for the Project. Glenn Griffin commented that hospitals are constructed where patients are and that emissions from the industrial pollution will cause health problems in the area.

Q5. (Glen Griffin) How high is the vent stack for the plant?

A5. (Fraser Forsythe) It is approximately 60 m high.

David Thompson indicated his confusion over increases in property values in the area based on information from Service New Brunswick which cited many recent property purchases. He commented that many of these purchases were made by Irving Oil Ltd. Fraser Forsythe reiterated that he is still looking for a good solution to the property value assessment issue. Gordon Dalzell suggested that two neighborhoods (e.g. Champlain Heights and Greendale) be studied to determine the difference in property values and use that information to help make an assessment of Red Head properties. Champlain Heights is located beside an industrial complex, while Greendale is located closer to local attractions. Fraser Forsythe responded that he would take this idea under advisement, that Canaport will not assess the value of each house on Red Head Road, and that Action Item 32-5 is ongoing.

Q6. (Jean Thompson) Who was appraiser for the EIA?

A6. (Fraser Forsythe) Mr. Dean Day (State Farm Insurance) made the insurance assessment.

Q7. (Jean Thompson) Who made the property assessment?

A7. (Fraser Forsythe) The impact on property assessment is based on the four previously mentioned criteria in the EIA prepared by Jacques Whitford.

Q8. (David Thompson) Will you have an update on this issue next month?

A8. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes, I will give you an update next month.

32-6: Fraser Forsythe spoke with 4 of the 6 residents immediately adjacent to the Secondary Egress Road in April.

Q9. (Gail Hamilton- Resident 1) Can a fence put up to keep my children away from the Egress road construction?

A9. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes, I will look into having a fencing put in place.

Q10. (Carol Armstrong) Will there be questions on the Secondary Egress Road later in the meeting?

A10. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes, Matt Alexander is here to answer your questions.

32-7: Fraser Forsythe is awaiting a reply from NB Power on the issue of power lines to the Canaport facility site.

Q11. (Teresa Debly) Who is your contact at NB Power?

A11. (Fraser Forsythe) My contact is Mr. Williamson.

Glen Griffin added that the present refinery has three power lines. Teresa Debly asked for clarification regarding the use the existing 69 KV line and if new lines would be installed for the Canaport LNG facility. She further asked if there would be more lines for the new refinery and if Canaport had any plans to do maintenance to the existing lines. Fraser Forsythe stated that he could not speak for the new refinery but Canaport LNG does not require new lines.

32-8: A project manager from Kiewit has been asked to attend CCELC meetings. Fraser Forsythe indicated that a spokesperson would be attending tonight's meeting; however, no one from Kiewit is present.

32-9: Action Item 30-4 (from February) is a presentation on EIS Commitments which is ready but has been set aside the past couple of months. It is not related to Carolyn Walker.

Q12. (Glen Griffin) How large must a wetland be to require compensation?

A12. (Fraser Forsythe) It must be at least two hectares in size.

Q13 (Teresa Debly) Why was the wetland across from the Red Head United Church not identified as requiring compensation?

A13 (Fraser Forsythe) It was not identified as a wetland.

Q14. (Teresa Debly) Didn't you see the water?

A14. (Fraser Forsythe) A wetland consultant has certain criteria that they look for during their assessment.

A14. (Matt Alexander) There are three criteria that are required to delineate a wetland: hydrology, vegetation and soil.

Q15. (Teresa Debly) What do those three criteria mean?

A15. (Matt Alexander) Hydrology identifies whether the wetland is permanently wet, vegetation identifies species of plants that are typical of a wetland, and the soil must be an appropriate type. All three of these criteria must be met for it to be classified as a wetland.

Q16. (Teresa Debly) There are springs here; are they wetlands?

A16. (Matt Alexander) They can sometimes be classified as wetlands.

Q17. (David Thompson) Why was that area not considered a wetland?

A17. (Matt Alexander) I believe that it did not have the correct soil and vegetation. I did identify wetlands on the side of Red Head Mountain that were not previously identified by the NBDENV.

Q18. (Teresa Debly) Is a swamp a wetland?

A18. (Matt Alexander) Yes, it is a type of wetland.

Q19. (Teresa Debly) The area across the street is not a wetland?

A19. (Matt Alexander) That is correct, it is not a wetland.

Glen Griffin added that the area across from the Red Head United Church was the same as the wetland at the back of Hazen Creek. Gordon Dalzell suggested that we go back through old documentation to check the assessment for the area. Fraser Forsythe stated that the information may be in the RHSAR EIA document but as it was not found to be a wetland, it was most likely not been included.

Q20. (Gordon Dalzell) Can someone look through the document to check this?

A20. (Fraser Forsythe) A walk through of the area was done when the centerline was cut.

Q21. (Teresa Debly) Where would I find information on the wetlands?

A21. (Matt Alexander) In the RHSAR EIA document.

Q22. (Teresa Debly) What month were you out to walk the centerline?

A22. (Matt Alexander) Surveys were done June through October 2005.

32-10: Rainer Malcharek and Gordon Dalzell have a meeting scheduled with Yvonne Huntingdon (Saint John Emergency Response Coordinator) on 17 May 2007 at #1 Fire Station (45 Leinster St.). Rainer Malcharek indicated that P. Groody is no longer the appropriate person to contact.

Gordon Dalzell asked for a clarification of the meeting minutes from 16 April 2007 meeting. He asked if the minutes could be edited to reflect that the concerns regarding the concrete on site was made by workers *and* contractors.

NBDENV Status Report

Carolyn Walker provided Environmental Status reports for April-May to all members in attendance. The Department continues to receive monitoring reports on a regular basis. Reportable incidents for the LNG site include two small spills, which were quickly and appropriately remediated. One TSS exceedence was reported on 13 April, however mitigative measures were implemented and no further exceedences have occurred. No public inquires were made in April-May.

Kathy Rogers expressed concern that the EPP (Phase III Offshore) was reviewed and comments were sent to the proponent on 23 February 2007 but the

EPP had not been issued. Carolyn Walker responded that Canaport was waiting for a Live Seabird Salvage Permit from Environment Canada which was required for the EPP to be completed.

Q26. (Gordon Dalzell) Who prepared the EPP?

A26. (Carolyn Walker) Canaport™ LNG_{LP}.

Fraser Forsythe indicated that an Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) is different from an EIA, as it is prepared and drafted for NBDENV approval and comment. An EPP provides a practical way for Project proponents to ensure that best management practices are implemented during construction activities. Gordon Dalzell, Kathy Rogers, and Teresa Debly requested copies of the Offshore EPP. Gordon Dalzell and Teresa Debly also requested copies of the EIA for the Secondary Egress Road. Carolyn Walker stated that offshore compliance is handled by the DFO and Environment Canada, not the NBDENV. Kathy Rogers expressed concern about the absence of the Kiewit spokesperson.

Action Item 33-1: Contact Kiewit to ensure a spokesperson will attend the next CCELC meeting.

Q27. (Kathy Rogers) Was the Scoter Report (from page 2 of the March-April Environmental Status Report) included in the EPP document?

A27. (Carolyn Walker) Yes, it is in the EPP.

Q28. (Peter Sherman) Are wells monitored in the area around the Church?

A28. (Carolyn Walker) No, wells are only monitored on the site.

A28. (Fraser Forsythe) Wells in this area have been surveyed.

Q29 (Gordon Dalzell) Can you elaborate on public inquiries? I called twice. Has the Department undertaken any independent reviews of concrete standards?

A29. (Carolyn Walker) The NBDENV does not assess concrete. Assessments are done by the Department of Public Safety.

Fraser Forsythe stated that the Department of Public Safety has a representative on the Canaport site frequently who audits various construction processes on site , including concrete, welding, and materials. Gordon Dalzell indicated he would like to see a copy of the regulatory responsibilities. Pierre Boilard noted that formal inspections are made regularly on the concrete and construction activities but reports are not necessarily made. Gordon Dalzell requested a presentation on the public safety process by the Department of Public Safety.

Action Item 33-2: Request a presentation on the public safety process and issues related to construction at the Canaport LNG site by the Department of Public Safety.

Q30. (Gordon Dalzell) Can a summary of changes made to the tracking database be provided monthly?

A30. (Carolyn Walker) Yes, I can try.

Q31. (Gordon Dalzell) Can the nature of the inquiry be recorded when public inquiries are made to the NBDENV?

A31. (Carolyn Walker) NBDENV is unable to provide personal information due to privacy protection issues.

Q32. (Glenn Griffin) Is Gordon asking if we should track changes to the EIA?

A32. (Fraser Forsythe) No. The EIA, HADD, WAWA, and Navigable Waters permits have many conditions applied to them. The tracking database lists permits with their associated conditions and identifies the current status of the conditions. Many of the conditions are on-going and do not change often. There are over 600 commitments and reviewing the database is time-consuming.

Q33. (Peter Sherman) Should a well be drilled and monitored on Alignment B?

A33. (Carolyn Walker) I will pass this request onto David Peterson, who is responsible for environmental compliance on the RHSAR.

Q34. (David Thompson) Who is responsible for rock from onshore blasting which lands in the water?

A34. (Carolyn Walker) NBDENV.

David Thompson expressed confusion over who oversees the onshore and offshore components of the Project and noted that Jim Kierstead (DFO) does not have information on blasted rock that landed in the water last fall. He also stated that he is frustrated that this issue has not been resolved since he first mentioned it in January 2007. Fraser Forsythe stated that sidescan sonars done of that area revealed more rock was present than previously thought that would need to be moved and that a letter of credit was required by the DFO to ensure compensation for a larger area of the seafloor impacted than originally authorized by the HADD for the pier. Fraser Forsythe also indicated that Jim Shute (DFO) inspected the site of the 27 September 2006 blast. David Thompson stated the Kiewit will not pay for the rock removal because it was not there prior to that particular blast and that Irving is currently removing the rock at their cost. He believes the difference in the amount of rock came from the blast. Carolyn Walker stated she is not aware of this issue and that David Peterson had not passed on this information.

(David Thompson) I am concerned about the lack of information available on the offshore work.

(Fraser Forsythe) We will be reporting on turbidity and sediment levels but Canaport does not have sidescan sonar images. They belong to Kiewit.

Pierre Boilard commented that there may be some confusion over two separate blasts, one that occurred in September and one in November 2006. SNC was responsible for the top portion of the blast in September and advised DFO of the blast near the water. Pierre Boilard indicated that a DFO representative was

present at the blast and no irregularities were reported at the time. He stated that approximately one month ago, he was informed that more rock was present at TB1 and that an investigation into this was underway. Pierre Boilard also indicated that storms could influence the bottom of the seafloor in that particular area. The blast in November, for the lower portion, was the responsibility of Kiewit.

David Thompson inquired about who is responsible for collecting this information and stated that he was at Roger Hunter's on the day of the blast and saw rocks covering the seaweed at low tide. His information indicates that no one from the DFO (Brian Keating, Ted Currie, Jim Kierstead) was present on that day. He was told that the next day Jim Shute was assigned to the file and reported nothing out of the ordinary had occurred as a result of the blast.

Q37. (Teresa Debly) David, at what time did the blast occur?

A37. (Pierre Boilard) I do not know. I was not present at the blast.

[Note: The actual time for the blast on 27 September 2006 was 12:05 and the blast on 1 November 2006 was 14:26].

Q38. (Kathy Rogers) Who does the blasting?

A38. (Fraser Forsythe) Consbec does the blasting, on behalf of Gulf Operators.

Q39. (Teresa Debly) Was the rock planned to go into the water?

A39. (Pierre Boilard) We do expect that some rock will fall into the water.

David Thompson requested the sidescan sonar information. Fraser Forsythe indicated that this is not Canaport property and that Kiewit has a sidescan sonar from 29 January 2007. Gordon Dalzell suggested that a formal request be made for this information to be documented and reported and that an information request be put into the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans under the Access to Information Act. Gordon Dalzell put a motion forward that David Thompson's questions related to the blasting associated with the pier be answered, documented, and reported. This motion was seconded by Peter Sherman. The motion was carried.

Action Item 33-3: Request that David Thompson's questions related to the blasting associated with the pier be answered, documented, and reported.

Stu Armstrong indicated that a federal environmental official should be present to address these issues. Fraser Forsythe stated that Jeff Cline (DFO) is a member of the CCELC. Peter Sherman commented that Action Items need to be addressed. Fraser Forsythe responded that Action Items are being addressed but sometimes take longer than expected. He indicated the David Thompson is playing an active role as a committee member by following up on these issues.

Action Item 33-4: Request the DFO to have a resource member more regularly available to the CCELC.

David Thompson commented that Transport Canada should be involved because of the potential impact this Project might have on cruise ships. Gordon Dalzell indicated that there is going to be a bylaw created under the Port Authority regarding a privately designated exclusion zone, which could interfere with and delay cruise ships. Fraser Forsythe responded that simulation analysis has been completed and there is no impact on cruise ships. Gordon Dalzell requested John McCann present the Saint John Harbour view on this issue and give a report on the bylaw development regarding exclusion zones to the CCELC.

Action Item 33-5: Request the Harbourmaster attend a CCELC meeting to present information on the bylaws related to exclusion zones and the Saint John Harbour view on increased traffic due to the Project.

A ten minute break was taken at this point.

Fraser Forsythe introduced Matt Alexander (Fundy Engineering) to answer questions about the Secondary Egress Road EIA and indicated that residents can ask questions directly.

Q40. (Andy Young) On page 25 it is indicated that cutting will occur outside of the migratory bird nesting season but information on page 31 contradicts this?

A40. (Matt Alexander) The start date is now expected to be in August, however if any cutting is required during nesting season, a bird expert will search the area and identify nests, which will be delineated and surrounded by a no-disturbance buffer.

Q41. (Andy Young) Why is baseline sound monitoring being done at Mispic Beach and not at my house?

A41. (Fraser Forsythe) It was required by the NBDENV.

Q42. (Andy Young) Why were Bean Brook, Beyea Brook, and Hazen Creek chosen for baseline information in this study?

A42. (Matt Alexander) These watercourses are part of the local area and representative of the kinds of streams you would find here. Other streams were included as listed on page 57 of the EIA document. S1-S10 are located on the property and S10 is the stream that will be impacted.

Q43. (Andy Young) What side of the road?

A43. (Matt Alexander) On the west side.

Q44. (Andy Young) Who takes the water quality measurements?

A44. (Matt Alexander) Fundy Engineering collects the samples and they are analyzed at Saint John Laboratory Services Ltd.

A44. (Fraser Forsythe) Weekly and monthly TSS levels are reported to the NBDENV and DFO.

Q45. (Andy Young) How are you going to compensate for the wetlands?

A45. (Matt Alexander) Wetland compensation projects are put forward to the NBDENV for approval. This is an on-going process.

Q46. (Andy Young) Is there any public involvement in the projects?

A46. (Matt Alexander) Public can provide input but usually the project is determined between the proponent and the NBDENV.

Q47. (Andy Young) How can a 750m culvert compensate for a 200m loss of wetland?

A47. (Matt Alexander) It does not compensate for loss, it channels the water.

Q48. (Andy Young) How do you characterize groundwater resources (pg. 70)?

A48. (Matt Alexander) By the aquifer that supplies the water.

Q49. (Andy Young) Is S-10 30ft deep? How do you determine culvert size?

A49. (Matt Alexander) Yes, it was previously excavated stream. It has a much smaller drainage area than Bean Brook. The size of the drainage area defines the culvert size. Crandall Engineering designed the culverts.

Q50. (David Thompson) Could we have more input into the HADD and compensation projects?

A50. (Matt Alexander) Yes, please bring any ideas or suggestions to me regarding possible projects and I will notify the proponent.

Glen Griffin inquired if a lobster rookery could be suggested as a compensation project. David Thompson responded that this has already been put forward and that the DFO would like to direct projects based on local interest and issues.

Q51. (Gordon Dalzell) What is being done to address security issues?

A51. (Matt Alexander) I have added this concern to the Public Involvement Report for the EIA and have taken this concern to the proponent.

Q52. (Merna Pearson) Why has the road name been changed from Egress to Emergency Access Road?

A52. (Matt Alexander) Egress means out, but regardless it is for emergency access only.

Q53. (David Thompson) Where will the gate be located?

A53. (Matt Alexander) At the tank farm end of the road. The proponent was not concerned about this issue.

Gordon Dalzell expressed his concern about the location of the gate. Teresa Debly inquired about the possibility of emergency vehicles colliding with ATVs on the road. Stu Armstrong added that he is concerned about the garbage that will be dumped on the road. Matt Alexander indicated that the gate will be operated by security on site. Gordon Dalzell requested that these concerns be taken to the proponent and recommended that the gate be put at the Red Head Road and be monitored by security in the same way.

Q54. (Carol Armstrong) Will this be used as a heavy haul road for the refinery?

A54. (Matt Armstrong) No. This road is not designed for that purpose. Please keep this question for public involvement during the refinery EIA process.

Q55. (Carol Armstrong) How were the six properties (page 2) affected?

A55. (Matt Alexander) Wetlands occur on the first three properties and the indirect impact area on wetlands extends onto the last three properties.

Q56. (Carol Armstrong) Was Proposed Option 2 not chosen because of light affecting residents?

A56. (Matt Alexander) Homes were located directly across from option 2 and light would shine directly into their windows.

Q57. (Andy Young) Will there be lights during construction?

A57. (Matt Alexander) Yes, but not during operation except for vehicles needed during an emergency.

Q58. (Teresa Debly) What will happen where the road crosses the pipeline?

A58. (Matt Alexander) The pipeline may be sleeved but specific engineering questions should be directed to Crandall Engineering.

Q59. (Andy Young) Why not have the road run parallel to the pipeline and come out by the Johnson property?

A59. (Matt Alexander) It would be impacting more wetland area, crossing Anthony's Brook, and would have to cross the pipeline twice.

David Thompson expressed his concern about the Eider Rock EIA and the absence of many wetlands that were indicated in this EIA.

Q60. (David Thomson) Fraser, have you addressed the issue of the Emergency Access Road with the fire department?

A60. (Fraser Forsythe) I am scheduled to meet with Chief Simonds this week to discuss the evacuation plan for the site.

Q61. (Andy Young) Will an amendment be made to the EIA for the change to a tighter curve in the road?

A61. (Matt Alexander) Yes.

Q62. (Andy Young) How does that affect our timeline to provide public input?

A62. (Matt Alexander) It should not change because it still falls within the original footprint for the roadway.

Q63. (Andy Young) There will be no blasting or pile driving?

A63. (Matt Alexander) No, if rock is to be broken, it will be done by hammering.

Q64. (Carol Armstrong) Has the road been started? What is the pile of rock?

A64. (Matt Alexander) The road is on the other side of the fence from the rocks.

A64. (Fraser Forsythe) The centre line has been cut but that is all the work that has been done on the road. The rocks are spoils from the Canaport site.

Q65. (Carol Armstrong) Will that rock be used for the road?

A65. (Fraser Forsythe) Potentially yes.

Q66. (Andy Young) Is there a prohibition on test pits in wetlands?

A66. (Matt Alexander) Yes.

Update on Onshore Work (SNC)

Pierre Boilard stated that the pour for the first tank is completed and took 25.5 days, which is an achievement considering the weather conditions. The tank is 39 m high now and work on the roof will begin after the final meter is finished. The second tank pour should begin 4 June or 11 June and is expected to take 20 days. Preparation of the sub-foundation for the third tank will begin following Canaport LNG approval. Work continues on the main control room area, which will be ready in October. Site preparation is expected to be finished by the end of July and piping will begin in June.

Q67. (Kathy Rogers) What percent complete is the onshore work?

A67. (Pierre Boilard) Approximately 20%. We have 400 people on site now.

Q68. (Kathy Rogers) When will the offshore work be complete?

A68. (Pierre Boilard). It is expected to be finished in Spring 2008.

Carol Armstrong expressed concern about a truck that left the Canaport site and did not stop at the entrance and passed another vehicle on a solid line. She will provide Pierre Boilard with the license plate information. Carol Armstrong also indicated there was a near collision of two vehicles from Canaport on her property.

Adjourned:

9:20 pm

Submitted by: Fundy Engineering

Next Meeting Date:

Monday 11 June 2007

Attachments:

Table of Outstanding Action Items- May 2007

Traffic Update- April 2007

NBDENV Monthly Status Report- April-May 2007

Table of Actions/Responsibilities – May 2007

Action #	Action	Responsible Party	Due Date
33-1	<i>Contact Kiewit to ensure a spokesperson will attend the next CCELC meeting.</i>	Canaport LNG	11 June 07
33-2	<i>Request a presentation on the public safety process and issues related to construction at the Canaport LNG site by the Department of Public Safety.</i>	Canaport LNG	11 June 07
33-3	<i>Request that David Thompson's questions related to the blasting associated with the pier be answered, documented, and reported.</i>	Canaport LNG	11 June 07
33-4	<i>Request the DFO to have a resource member more regularly available to the CCELC.</i>	CCELC/ Canaport LNG	11 June 07
33-5	<i>Request the Harbourmaster (John McCann) attend a CCELC meeting to present information on the bylaws related to exclusion zones and the Saint John Harbour view on increased traffic due to the Project.</i>	Canaport LNG	11 June 07