

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>PURPOSE</b>	Notes from a Small Group Meeting for the Woodfibre LNG Project Community Consultation held on February 4, 2014 at the Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse, West Vancouver, B.C.
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.
<b>MEETING RECORDER</b>	Kai-lani Rutland, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.
<b>PRESENTER</b>	Byng Giraud, Vice President, Corporate Affairs, Woodfibre LNG
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Cheryl Cameron Cheryl Morisseau Dan Rogers Dave Patrick Don Cameron Eoin Finn Gillian Smith Jeremy Moorhouse, Tides Canada Laurie Parkinson Graham Parkinson Linda Olivier Lucinda Jones Manny Sidhu Mark Donnelly Mona Bengé Ramona Materi Shellene Paull
<b>PROJECT TEAM ATTENDEES</b>	AG Gelotti, President, Woodfibre LNG Byng Giraud, Vice President, Corporate Affairs, Woodfibre LNG Alex Brigden, Project Director, Woodfibre LNG Marian Ngo, Manager, Communications and External Relations, Woodfibre LNG Calum McClure, Liquiline Reece Fowler, Golder Associates Gord Addison, Innovative Research Dave Bennett, Director, External Relations, FortisBC Megan Harris, Capital Projects Consultation and Communications, BC Hydro
<b>AGENDA</b>	1. Welcome and Review Agenda 2. Discussion Guide 3. Closing Remarks

<b>KEY THEMES</b>
-------------------

- Some participants were concerned with the navigation of LNG carriers in Howe Sound, requesting that Woodfibre LNG provide additional information and a detailed shipping plan.
- Some participants were interested in promoting tourism and recreational use of Howe Sound.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Some participants expressed disapproval at the proposed location of the Project, suggesting Howe Sound was the wrong choice for this type of industrial activity and shipping.
- Some participants were concerned with and requested additional information about a worst case scenario in which an LNG carrier ran aground or was otherwise ruptured.
- Some participants were concerned that the floating liquefaction facility would be the first of its kind.
- Some participants were concerned that the change of ownerships of the LNG as it is moved on to the ship would create a situation where liability is undefined. Some participants wanted assurances that the buyers would carry enough insurance to cover leaks, spills and accidents.

*The record notes that the meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.*

*(Abbreviations will be used and mean – Q: Question, A: Answer, C: Comment)*

## 1. WELCOME AND REVIEW OF AGENDA

*Judy Kirk welcomed participants and explained the format of the meeting. Judy informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy and that questions and comments would be attributed to participants in the meeting notes.*

## 2. DISCUSSION GUIDE

C: *Byng Giraud:* I am going to jump right in, thank you for taking the time out to spend your time with us this evening. Related to page 2, this is the first round of community consultation that this project is undertaking. We will be doing this for the next couple of weeks, and then there will be probably be a second round that is mandated by the environmental assessment agencies. We'll do a third round of consultation to sum up what's been learned and what the communities are interested in. We're in the very early stages of this project. You may have read a little bit about it in the media. As of only last week we received notification from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency that we are now entering the environmental assessment (EA) process. We haven't actually made an application, we've just been told that we are now in the process. The application itself is many months away. There will be many rounds of community consultation until we get to that stage. You are at the very beginning. So essentially page 2 is simply that. Outlining what we're doing in this first round, and I want to emphasize, it is just the first round.

On page 3 – What is the project? We've described it as "small scale" and I say "small scale" because compared to the ones that you are reading about up North, it is a tenth of the size. It's a small scale LNG processing facility that we are hoping to build on the old Woodfibre Pulp Mill site. We've chosen the site for a number of reasons. There is an existing FortisBC pipeline – the same pipeline that takes gas to Squamish, Whistler and also Vancouver Island. That pipeline passes through that site, so with some expansion we can use the existing pipeline. There are existing transmission lines there, so there is power to the site. It's an old industrial site that's had about a hundred years of industrial use and some pollution, some old landfill and some soils that need to be remediated. We're actually taking an old polluted site and we're going to clean it up a little bit and improve it,

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

so we're not clearing a green field site. Not knocking down something that's pristine. We're also interested, because it's an historic port, and an historic water port – so it was taking ships of that size. It is zoned industrial in the Municipality of Squamish and it is considered industrial in the official community plan, so there are a lot of advantages. We looked around British Columbia and came to this site to build the facilities. Our project is to build, essentially a factory, to be very simplistic, and we have more technical people here that will get into the detail, that is going to take that gas, cool it, liquefy it so it takes up less volume, put it on a ship and sell it to our customers. That's our proposal. The second column there just says "what are we doing at the site right now?" So we are looking at technology, making technology choices. The technology hasn't been chosen. We are cleaning up the site – doing about \$7 million in remediation. We are making sure we have access to gas to buy. We obtained an export license from the Government of Canada before Christmas to sell gas. You need an export license and that's been given to us and we're at beginning stages of EA. That's the project to-date.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Any questions so far?

Q: *Mona Benge:* Is the environmental assessment done by the provincial or federal government?

A: *Byng Giraud:* We trigger both the Federal and Provincial processes and so at this point we've been accepted into both processes.

Q: *Mona Benge:* But will one supersede the other?

A: *Byng Giraud:* No. But there is the possibility that there will be what they call, substitution – that the provincial government will be able to do portions of the federal government work. But they call it substitution because it's not one process. There is still a federal process and a provincial process running.

A: *Judy Kirk:* And there will be decisions made by the federal and provincial authorities.

A: *Byng Giraud:* All the provincial regulators and federal regulators are still at the table.

Q: *Mona Benge:* I'm not very well versed in this so I'm just asking questions that come to me. Will you be listing what parts of the EA have been assessed by the provincial or federal government?

C: *Judy Kirk:* I'll answer that Byng, if you don't mind. The regulatory agencies, so BCEAO – the BC Environmental Assessment Office – they have a website and all the projects that they are undertaking an EA of, or overseeing, they list there, and the same thing with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. They have a separate website and they, too, list the projects.

Q: *Mona Benge:* And they say there, what parts of the project they are assessing?

A: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, they do. Now, they haven't clarified that to Woodfibre. Woodfibre is here earlier than normal, and so the Province hasn't yet clarified everything that they will be doing or requiring, but they have said that they are interested.

A: *Byng Giraud:* That decision, the federal government hasn't made that decision. So I'm hoping to hear in the next two weeks actually.

Q: *Mona Benge:* So they are the ones that decide who is doing what?

A: *Byng Giraud:* Yes, the Province requests it. We don't actually ask for it. It's not something we are allowed to do. So the Province makes a request to the Federal government to see if they can combine efforts on part of the EA, and the Federal government decides. That hasn't taken place yet. The Province has requested but the Feds haven't answered.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Eoin Finn*: But you requested the Province to request the Feds, no? You wrote to the Province and requested that the substitution be invoked. The Province then wrote to the Feds and requested that substitution. Am I correct?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Do you mean in the Project Description?
- Q: *Eoin Finn*: There has been the Memorandum of Understanding between the two governments. There is the agreement that B.C. can request that there be a substitution of B.C.'s process for the Federal process, that was triggered by the Province but it was at your request. That was my understanding.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Let me go back and check, but I didn't sign such a letter and our team is quite small. So I'll have to check and see if that's part of the Project Description. I am not aware of this, but I can look in to it. Reece?
- A: *Reece Fowler*: That doesn't sound familiar to me.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: At the federal level, the EA, would it be done according to the new Omnibus bills that were introduced. It was C38 and C45 that made vast changes to the guidelines of EA. My question is will your project be evaluated using the new regulations?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: We would be evaluated under the existing legislation which is CEAA2012.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: Which one is it?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: CEAA2012 – *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012*.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But I would say that, with the amount of information that Byng has just given you, and unless Reece, with your environmental expertise with Golder, that they can perhaps answer some other questions but they can't speak for the regulators. They can't answer questions about scope or nature of the review, because they are not regulators.
- Q: *Don Cameron*: I understand why you would want to run such a business, I'm sure it would be quite profitable but what I don't understand is Canadians in general who would want to have – you've mentioned that this is about one tenth of the size of the ones up the coast – and why wouldn't we just have three up the coast, instead of 10 dotted all around potentially causing more risk? I'm not heavy on the risk part. I'm trying to understand the logic from a Canadian perspective, not yours – I understand yours entirely. Why would we not want to have three big ones instead of two big ones and 10 little ones? That, I don't get. Is there an answer to that? Is there an efficiency somewhere that I don't see?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Part of the issue is that each individual company proposes their project; we are hoping our project is successful but not all proceed. I've come from other industrial sectors and there are many other projects that are proposed and not all of them proceed. We're probably going to go through something like that as well. We are hoping that our project is successful. It is somewhat independent of whatever happens up north. In fact, quite independent because they are looking at large pipelines and much larger scale to serve gas fields that they own. We don't own gas fields so we have a very different business model. As to how should the Government of Canada, the people of Canada choose their industrial development strategy, it's sort of out of our hands.
- Q: *Don Cameron*: You don't have a direct response to me saying "Well it would be smart to do this because..." I'm not hearing that.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: No.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- C: *Judy Kirk*: That is exactly the kind of thing to put on the back piece with additional comments. You know, there is no question in here or anywhere, and that kind of comment and the information summarized in this meeting – and we just captured that comment – and anything you put in the feedback form will be summarized and will form part of the ultimate record that goes into the Environmental Assessment Process.
- A: *Don Cameron*: I appreciate that.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: How old is the FortisBC pipeline that is planned to be used?
- A: *Carol Greaves*: It was constructed originally to serve Vancouver Island in 1991.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: If you wouldn't mind this is one of those moments when I would like to ask Byng to continue on. And in particular go through the key elements of the project on pg. 5.
- C: *Byng Giraud*: Firstly, I'd like to do a quick run by page 4. When you start on a project, you ask, why this location, why here? I've talked about some of the broader issues like access to gas but this is an old, well-used industrial site. We have an opportunity here to diminish the visual impact, to remediate the soils. If you look at the picture on the bottom, in the middle, that's actually a salmon-bearing creek that runs through the property. In the modern world you could never build such a setback for vegetation. There are things that we can do to actually improve the site so we think that we can not only take a zoned industrial site and make it a better place but also serve its purpose as an industrial site.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: What's the position of the historically-responsible parties?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: The current owners are Western Forest Products.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: And what's their indemnity?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: I honestly don't know what their indemnity is.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: Shouldn't they be responsible for cleaning up the site? Isn't that the Province's job to do that?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: We are paying for the remediation because we want to use the site. As you know, there are some brown field industrial properties that if somebody owns it and just simply maintains it, they have no obligation to clean it up because they are not selling it and they are not transferring it to anybody else, so as long as they maintain it to prevent any further pollution, it can be left for a long period of time as long as it's not adding to the pollution, until they want to sell it. So some of the detail on this: There are four landfills on this site. One is very large – probably needs some sizing and stability. One has asbestos in it. There are a hundred years of hydrocarbons on it. We've actually spent several million dollars dredging the foreshore where there was decades of woodchips and wood waste that's been dumped in the water that has essentially denuded the shoreline and ruined any fish habitat. So we are hoping we can recover the site.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: So who owns the site?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Western Forest Products owns the site.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: Completely? Do you have an agreement with them?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: It's an option to purchase, subject to this remediation being completed. So we've said, we're going to pay you, and it's a public number, because it's a publicly traded company, we bought the site for about \$25 million. Part of that is that they must come to us with a certificate of compliance to the Ministry of Environment, that they have remediated the site. Remediated the site doesn't mean that you can go out there and farm it. It's still an industrial site. There are certain uses that will probably never be allowed on this site. It will remain an industrial site. But they can

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

remediate it to the point where we can use it for other purposes. And we can also cap those landfills, cover them with plants. Do the things that the Ministry of Environment requires you to do when you are closing or transferring a site.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* If you could go to Page 5 and go through the key elements of the project.
- C: *Byng Giraud:* I'm going to get a little help on this probably from AG here. I'm going to run through the main pieces and that will probably garner some questions. What will actually be on there? We have a natural gas metering station because we need to know, we're buying the gas from FortisBC. We're metering as it comes off the pipeline. Again the pipeline passes right through our property. The old pulp mill did use gas so there's a pipeline that comes with the property. A natural gas pre-treatment system, and we can get some more technical details from some of the folks here but simple things like, the gas that you have in your home has a smell to it, that's artificially added for safety reasons, so you smell that you have gas leaking in your house. We have to remove those things to make it a gas that we can actually liquefy to put on the ships. A jetty, fairly obvious, for the loading. A liquefaction plant, in layman's terms, is the factory that makes the gas cold.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* You skipped over the phrase there "would be disposed of according to environmental regulations". Would the removed additives from the natural gas be stored on site?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* That's a question we had earlier today about some the things that we're taking out.
- A: *AG Gelotti:* For any contaminants that is in the natural gas that comes out of the FortisBC pipeline that we remove, we will properly put those elements into proper containers and dispose of them according to environmental regulations.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Will that be on-site or off-site? Is that committed?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* We'll be regulated. We don't have to commit.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Are you committed to the regulations or off the site?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* To the regulations.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* So you might dispose of them on-site then, if you are not committed.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* We don't think so. But we can look into it. It's a good question. We don't think so, because we don't have a disposal facility on site.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* What's in your application? You have to apply for one or the other.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Graham, it is so early in the project that their application hasn't even started. Is that correct?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* That's correct.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So I think these guys are trying to answer in as clear a way as possible.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* There are a lot of things that aren't very clear in here. They say they might use 140 megawatts of power but they don't say that they are going to commit to electrical power. They might change to combustion.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So let's answer that question.
- C: *Byng Giraud:* Let's step back here. I am months away from an EA application, a formal application. I am only just getting into the process. I can't even get some of the permits that I need to be seeking until I get my EA certification in hand.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* But you have the Project Description.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* The Project Description is the only part that has taken place.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* But the Project Description doesn't have any description. It doesn't tell you whether you are going to be using electricity.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Let's get the question answered around electricity.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- A: *Byng Giraud*: We don't have the answer right now, is the short answer. Our preference would be to go to electricity.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: But how can you assess the environmental impacts if you don't answer that question.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Because I haven't entered the environmental process yet. The Project Description is basically your ticket to entry. We have to provide a 150 page document that explains what we propose to do to start the process.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But the point is, Byng, to Graham's question, at some point you will have to choose if you will power this by electricity or by gas, and that will have to be assessed and the regulators will tell you if you have correctly planned for that and what conditions would be put on that.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson*: Once you have applied for that electricity or gas for power, how far along is that in the process and hearings?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Before we make our formal environment assessment application, which is again, months away, what the government will require and maybe Reece can speak to that, is a working group with the community. They will require us to do things like this, although this one is of our own volition, to get input as to what the values of the community are. We can't actually apply until we know what is important.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But the question was, I think, and correct me if I'm wrong, Laurie, what you want to know is, if that decision about electrically powering the facility is made, will it be made before the application, for environmental certification? I think the answer to that is yes, you must do that.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Yes. They'll need more detail at that stage. They will require more detail than this Project Description. That's where we really have to get into the detail.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Here's what I want to say: I don't know the technical aspects of this project obviously. I run the consultation and engagement process. Many people say "Why didn't you come and talk to us sooner?" So here this organization is, talking to you very soon. I just want us to understand how soon this is. The application has not been filed for environmental certification, nor have the Province or the Federal government clearly defined what is required of this organization. That's how early we are in this process, for those of you who might be familiar with some steps.
- C: *Marian Ngo*: And by early, we are still undergoing the baseline environmental studies, that Reece can speak more to that, but it's just about better understanding the site, the sensitivities and taking that into consideration, which would then be used as consideration for how to design the Project, how to even approach it. So the first thing is to understand the site.
- C: *Reece Fowler*: And being flexible with the types of studies, the baseline work that we are doing, so that we can work with the engineers to look for the most appropriate solution for the site whether it be environmentally and or for the community as well.
- Q: *Cheryl*: Two questions. One is, you've mentioned these impurities in the gas that need to be removed, could you give us an idea of what kind of volume you are looking at, whatever it is, 2 million tonnes, compared to your total volume, what type of volume are we talking about are these impurities that need to be dealt with?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Fractions of a per cent.
- Q: *Jeremy Moorhouse*: Two questions. One on impurities in the gas, from my understanding CO<sub>2</sub> is one that you have to remove. And that seems to be around 2% or so. I'm assuming that's vented?

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- A: *AG Gelotti:* Any CO<sub>2</sub> that will be removed from the natural gas will be vented.
- Q: *Jeremy Moorhouse:* Just following up on the electricity or natural gas discussion. I know it's very early stages, but what are the criteria for picking one or the other, what are the criteria you are using for evaluating those two options, and then, are there technical barriers, if you need that power do you have to does BC Hydro, build a transmission network. Is there enough power available?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* We have to undertake a system impact study with BC Hydro. We have done a partial, that we asked them to do in the fall but it's only partial, so we are still in the middle of that system impact study. We are looking at what sort of upgrades are required, redundancies are required, what the costs are going to be. So that's taking place right now. As we've stated in the document, our preference is to go to electric, we understand the issues and frankly it's important at this stage when we are thinking about this that we hear that this is a priority issue for the communities because it is part of our interaction with government, with BC Hydro and even our own internal decision about what we're going to do. So we have a preference, I think our preferences match but we don't have enough information yet.
- Q: *Don Cameron:* I'd like a little more information on the pipeline that will be going by, obviously that's a huge draw to what you want to do. It's historically has been servicing Vancouver Island. How much of it is underutilized? You've talked about needing to... I mean that's your flow of gas but if that gas is already going somewhere else...
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So is this a question for FortisBC?
- Q: *Don Cameron:* He should have the answer because he's expecting x number of cubic feet coming through a day.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* We're clear on what we're going to get out of them but the existing use of the gas will have to be something that you will have to ask FortisBC – what is the existing use of the gas?
- A: *Carol Greaves:* I don't know what percentage we use, but it's designed for a degree day which is the coldest day in a number of years, so certainly it's not at full capacity all the time. But in order to provide natural gas service to Woodfibre LNG, we would have to expand that system.
- Q: *Don Cameron:* And what does that look like? Is that another pipeline?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Alright, Don. Carol should explain right now what process you are in.
- A: *Carol Greaves:* The Vancouver Island pipeline system is 602 km long. It starts in Coquitlam and comes through the Coquitlam Watershed, it comes through the Indian River Watershed into Squamish, across to Woodfibre, it serves then the Sunshine Coast, Powell River, comes to Vancouver Island and serves from Campbell River right down to Oak Bay. Of that 602 km, we would have to expand 52 km in order to meet the volumes that Woodfibre have requested.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And right now you are in an Environmental Assessment, correct?
- A: *Carol Greaves:* We are undergoing an EA process yes.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* I'm not sure what you mean by expanding 52. What's 52? So a larger pipe?
- A: *Carol Greaves:* We are adding a larger pipe alongside the existing pipe and the two will work together.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* Just for a portion of it?
- A: *Carol Greaves:* Just for 52 km of 602 kms.
- Q: *Don Cameron:* So an additional pipe. That makes sense.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Eoin Finn:* I'm trying to get a rough estimate. If you have to go to gas turbine for your power source what proportion of your gas supply will you be cannibalizing for that?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* 9%
- C: *Byng Giraud:* Looking back to the configuration on the site, you will see that there is a jetty, liquefaction plant, which in my simple terms is for the gas to be made cold. The reason it's made cold, for a layman like me to understand, is because it takes up 600 times less volume, so it's easier to transport. A storage system that's also moored there, then the marine terminal and transfer system, how the LNG would be put on to the vessels, and supporting infrastructure (docks, admin buildings, helipad). If you see the diagram below, this is the preferred configuration as we see it now.
- Q: *Don Cameron:* How will employees get to site?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* There will not be a road. We've been in communication with the Municipality of Squamish about how to best access the site. During construction we'll need barge access obviously. But when employees are being moved – they are redeveloping their downtown area, the Squamish Oceanfront Development Corporation, and is looking at different sort of water access for the public, so we are in discussion as to whether we would run our people from that location or if we would be from the same old site which is Darrell Bay. So we are actually in a conversation with the community because they are trying to revitalize the community and having people transiting downtown is in their interest.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* I'm just wondering if at this time I can ask you about the carriers. How many? Are they daily? And how large are the ships? I'm wondering about the marine traffic.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* Based on the amount of gas we have and the size of the ships, we anticipate three or four per month. We say four because there is a little bit of variation, particularly in the summertime, when there is less gas used by people heating their houses. We're saying in some of the documents, less than 40 a year. In terms of size, Alex?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* Size – we are still studying the shipping requirements, but the ships will be in the range of 140,000 cubic meters to 180,000 cubic meters.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* But what does that mean?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* The ships will be around 300 meters in length. In comparison to the freighters going to Squamish already, the vessels will be twice as long.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* Will the ships be doubled hulled?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* Yes.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* And barge traffic?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* We are still studying in terms of construction, how many barges we will need for construction. I don't have that right now. It's part of an ongoing study.
- Q: *Byng Giraud:* But during operation there is minimal traffic to the site.
- A: *Alex Brigden:* Yes. Well, during operations there will be barge traffic for certain equipment we have to bring in and also for maintenance purposes. And again, this is part of an ongoing study. We are just in the very early stages of our engineering and operations studies but we will inform you of that information as the studies are completed.

**MEETING DETAILS****Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014**

West Vancouver Small Group Meeting  
February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.  
Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse  
West Vancouver, BC

- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: I have a few comments for you on your facilities. Particularly, I have some concerns about the liquefaction system proposed on a floating structure. I can understand from your point of view how you would like to get constructed offshore where the labour costs are cheaper and where you can bring the equipment in, and have mobile equipment, so that if you have some dispute with the regulators, or if you need to negotiate with the regulators for more favourable jurisdiction somewhere else, you can take it elsewhere, but that's a point of business you probably thought about. But my concern as a resident, and as a 50 year resident in the area, having spent a considerable amount of time cleaning up the area, and promoting the marine growth and recovery of the area, is that the floating situation of all the rotating machinery on the barges, is going to create an enormous amount of noise for all the marine mammals. As a matter of fact I can't think of a worse situation for putting rotating machinery. First of all, it's not a very good foundation, all the fatigue issues. As an engineer, I think I'd be a little concerned about that for long life, but you've probably figured that out. But can you imagine if you were a mammal whose survival is dependent on communication through the medium that you live in? Like sound and how far the noise carries through water. And you've got rotating machinery. A floating metal drum! Can you imagine how much noise that creates in the water? The humpback whales. I don't know if you've been out in Howe Sound much – have you seen the humpbacks?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: I have not.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: Have you seen the dolphins?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: I have seen dolphins.
- C: *Graham Parkinson*: There's a lot. There are thousands of them. And have you seen the Orcas? They all communicate with sound. There are going to be adverse impacts with the sound and I'd like to suggest that you may want to consider putting it on land.
- A: *AG Gelotti*: Well if you've noticed, a part of our baseline studies that we are doing does include noise. So that's one area that we are studying and you make a very good point there – thank you.
- C: *Alex Brigden*: I want to raise one point on the regulatory part that you mentioned. We will be regulated under the EA which was described, which is, a provincial and a federal process. But also have to conform to CSA which will be regulated under the BC Oil and Gas Commission and the BC Safety Authority. So there will not be a separate regulatory process for us. We have to comply in full with the Oil and Gas Commission requirements.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: Do they cover pipelines do they?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: No, they cover liquefaction plants with regulations 276.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: And they cover noise?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: I'm not sure that it specifically covers noise.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But I think what AG was talking about in terms of the noise study but also I would assume Reece, the wildlife studies they would cover that too, would they not?
- C: *Reece Fowler*: At the moment, the baseline collection that we're taking for noise relates to under the water, as well as noise above the water, so on the land. So getting an idea of what is there at the moment and then once the design is further developed, we can start discussions with the engineering team to ensure that we have the lowest noise emissions possible.
- Q: *Mona Bengé*: Oh I'm back to the tankers because I've never seen one in real life. So its 300 meters long – how high is it?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: Depends on the type of tanker but in general it will be around 20 meters.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Mona Benge*: Are there a lot of choice in tankers – smaller, bigger?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: The study range at the moment is between 140,000 cubic meters and 180,000 cubic meters of storage, which changes the dimensions slightly – so between 280 to 300 meters. Not much.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: Now when you out here, as I recall growing up here, it really narrows down doesn't it? So how much space do you need to turn those things?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: The turning of these types of vessels is tug assisted and they turn within their own length. There is a requirement for one-and-a-half times on either side of the vessel for a turning circle. But any turning that has to take place will be regulated and assessed under the TERMPOL Study that we do with Transport Canada and they will assess where the turning and maneuvering of the vessel can take place.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: Are these big vessels, because that's high – that's like almost 200 feet high right? So are they affected by the high winds that sometimes come into Howe Sound?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: How would these big vessels be affected by a high wind as they come into Howe Sound?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: They are high windage vessels. The turning will be assisted by tugs and in general LNG ships have thrusters to assist with the maneuvering and slow speed turning. High windage means the vessels are high-sided. As the naval architects that designed the vessels are aware that there is a high side on the vessels so that the wind is something which they have to design for.
- A: *Calum McClure*: The TERMPOL process really looks at all aspects of ship maneuvering, the capabilities of ships, so that's thoroughly assessed through a very detailed process with Transport Canada and we are regulated by what they require, coming out of those processes.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: For me that doesn't mean much. It's a narrow area, what happens if something goes wrong? I mean, we only have two tugs right?
- A: *Calum McClure*: And these studies that take place actually look at how that can be mitigated and that comes out through the recommendations from Transport Canada.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: So will they say "no, you can't go out there" and turn around'?
- A: *Calum McClure*: They will look at the entire route and the route will get assessed, the ships will get assessed on that route. So that's part of the detailed studies that will be embarked on.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: How do you handle all of the traffic that goes in and out of Howe Sound at the same time as these ships are going to be coming in and out?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: So, that's a very good question, because it's something we've heard a lot. And so we will have to do greater studies about interaction with other traffic. But as we get up to closer to Squamish and to the terminal there actually is a little bit less traffic but there are ships going up there now and this is a historic port and there were ships going in there. So a lot of that stuff Transport Canada does understand, what you really have to look at is interaction with recreational users and further south we have to look at interaction with BC Ferries. There is a lot of data for Vancouver Harbour out to Ocean Pass, Victoria. There are 14,000 ship movements a year. There is less data from the base of Howe Sound out to Squamish. Particularly when it comes to non-commercial vessels because people don't count all the pleasure vessels. That's where work hasn't been done. So we're going to have to do some of that work.
- Q: *Lucinda Jones*: I'd like some clarification, are the ships a third of a kilometer long? They are supposed to turn and maneuver in amongst the small craft and the ferries and the mammals and the islands? This is a lot. I've seen on websites the comparative between these tankers and the

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- tankers we are familiar with in the harbour and I think they may be another half again. Do you know our common traffic tankers that we have in Vancouver harbour?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* In Vancouver it is not unusual to have tankers of that size. There are many, many and they are oil tankers and cruise ships and container ships – some in excess of that size. And I would also like to say that if you look at a full laden container ship, the windage of a fully laden container ship is comparable, if not larger, than one of these LNG ships.
- C: *Lucinda Jones:* But we don't have them coming up into the harbour.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* What are coming in to Howe Sound now, are smaller vessels. So this is what we talked about a third of the size larger. So in a busy month, Squamish Terminal tells us they are getting 12 of those smaller vessels. So they are about two-thirds of what we just said, so 200 meters give or take. Those ships are coming in right now. Where the turning would take place? That should be pointed out. So we do have to worry about interaction with recreational users and with the ferries as we're heading up the sound but the turning happens in an area where there isn't a lot of activity. And part of our studies is to find out what's going on there now. Are recreational users using that area over by the Woodfibre site? Is there anybody in that area? Commercial fishing, which there isn't a lot of...
- Q: *Lucinda Jones:* Well the thing is we are looking at an environment that is finally getting its legs back and so what you see now in the way of tourism and other uses such as fishing is not how it's going to be in the future. So there is going to be more demand of a healthier nature than what you see today.
- C: *Laurie Parkinson:* So with this proposal we would have 3 to 4 really large tankers going up there. If the proposal for BURNCO gravel works out for BURNCO, we're also going to have increased large barge traffic going up to this area as well. It is true that this area has an industrial history and for going back quite a ways the industrial history has a very polluting past. We have, as you mentioned, come a long way to get our marine life back, also in the cleaning up of the Britannia Mine site, which my husband was heavily involved in. It is an area of spectacular natural beauty, which used to be remote and industry was noticed less then. It is now not remote and heavily used recreationally. It seems like this is the wrong direction to go to be increasing industry there. I know that the site has been industrial in the past, however the general area is changing gears, and becoming a wonderful natural area and is heavily used recreationally. And you mix a really big increase in industrial use and industrial shipping with all those little boats and all the natural beauty coming back – I am uncomfortable with that.
- Q: *Dave Patrick:* Can we go back to page 3? Byng mentioned that your company made an offer to Western Forest Products to buy the property, based on remediation conducted by Western Forest Products?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* Yes, we purchased the site, paid the additional amount for them to remediate the site because we felt because they were the local company, they were already there, they were in a better position to do the remediation.
- Q: *Dave Patrick:* Are there any subjects on that offer?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* The subject is the certificate of compliance from the Ministry of Environment.
- Q: *Dave Patrick:* Approval of your site?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* The Ministry of Environment must give the certificate of compliance that the remediation has been done properly and successfully, at that point we will close the deal.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Dave Patrick:* Just remediation but not, the subject doesn't say 'subject to your company receiving complete endorsement for your opening an LNG project'.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I just want to make clear, especially for everyone here, that there's a Part A and a Part B. Part A is about the land, and the remediation of the land and being just described would have to occur for the transfer of ownership to occur. That is, the Ministry of Environment would have to issue a Certificate. Part B is the Environmental Assessment this project would be required to go through and it would have to, wouldn't be allowed to proceed unless it was certified with conditions.
- Q: *Dave Patrick:* What if it gets turned down, then they are stuck with the property?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Right. Thank you. That helps a lot.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* I just have to understand and visualize what the worst case scenario can be if one of these 300 meter tankers does run aground or have a collision with a large vessel. What happens when it comes open? I've seen many pictures of oil spills. But I don't know what happens when one of these tankers discharges its load.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* I'm going to get AG go through the detail of it. The center pages are frequently asked questions and we do try and address those questions. We have anticipated some of them. So some of that is in there for you to take home and take some extra copies to share with people you are talking to. But over to AG, what happens?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Well in the unlikely event that there is a collision, first of all, the LNG tankers are double hulled. So that's another level of safety for the ship. If the inner tank happened to be damage where there was LNG leaking from the ship into the sea, then the liquid LNG would vaporize. The water being warmer acts as a heat sink so its absorbing the cold. As the LNG vaporizes it's mostly methane gas. Methane gas is lighter than air and it will slowly dissipate and rise and depending on the wind it disperses as it's rising.
- A: *Alex Brigden:* In all of the shipping operations there has not been one loss of containment from any LNG ship. There has not been one single incident that has resulted in a container system failure, leaking LNG.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* But you realize that we are expecting anytime, like a subduction earthquake here? Cascadia? So it could be a little bit different.
- Q: *Eoin Finn:* I am aware of some work done recently by Sandia Labs, in the US, talking about what would happen, if either by a terrorist act or an accident as you described, to these LNG tankers. You would recall that after 9/11, Boston Harbour refused to have one of these tankers in the harbor for just that reason. Sandia Labs has defined, for the given conditions and different types of membrane or other containers for this gas, what would happen in such a collision has described a kill zone of several kilometers around such a ship, under the worst possible conditions. Is such a plume study part and parcel of what you are proposing, of what will be done here?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* I am familiar with it.
- C: *Eoin Finn:* This was recently given to a community of US Senate, chaired by the Vice President.
- A: *Alex Brigden:* I am aware of the Sandia Labs report, and the industry is aware of the report. There has not been a significant incident with an LNG ship so the report is speculation on their engineering studies. The shipping of LNG is highly regulated by international standards and we will comply with those standards in full for the ships that we use.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Now I think you had a question Eoin about a plume study. As part of this EA, will there be such a study?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* We will undertake a gas dispersion study so we will understand dispersion of gas in the event of any incidents. We haven't undertaken that study yet.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Will that include a full catastrophic event chain such as a failure effects mode analysis for loss of containment and ignition?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* We will undertake the gas dispersion studies on the basis of the regulatory requirements for what we have to look into and the industry standards.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Do you know what that is?
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Will that include a failure effects mode analysis for loss of containment and ignition?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* There will be an element of failure effects.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Will that consider the catastrophic outcomes?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* It will consider the loss of containment.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* But not ignition?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* We're here to listen and find out if there are things that we should be adding to this. This is the beginning before we actual enter into some of these studies. So it's worthwhile for you to...
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* This was a report that Sandia Labs was commissioned to do and you're calling it speculation.
- A: *Alex Brigden:* We didn't commission Sandia, it was commissioned.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* So a reputable lab thought there might be a credible chain of events that could occur and you are calling it speculation?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* I didn't call it speculation. I said it's an engineering study because there hasn't been an incident which has resulted in loss of containment.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Obviously Graham, you've got expertise and I just want to make sure the rest of us keep up...
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* I'm just looking for an answer to a question that was all. We didn't get an answer.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* No, I understand that. I just want to point out, on page 15, the guide points out a range of studies – so Graham the one that you are talking about, or at least the extent of the study that you think should occur, please put it down here. I just wanted to make sure that people understood that there are places where you can put that.
- C: *Byng Giraud:* So just so you know we are jumping over pages 6 and 7, those are the FAQs. Some of the FAQs we thought might be asked. So we can take you back to those questions maybe later. So, you will see on page 8, the bottom half of the page, opportunities for public input – we are doing this part of the community consultation of our own volition, trying to find out what the community wants, what it's values are, before we get heavily into the process. Further community consultation will take place, both directed by the regulator and additional work by ourselves, before we submit our application.

Then we'll actually apply and there are public consultation elements to that application. So we are just at the very beginning of the process that will take months that we have to go through. Below is

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

our anticipated timeline based on what we understand on how these processes work from the regulators. We filed our project description at the end of November/beginning of December 2013. That allowed both the federal and provincial governments to decide whether or not we have to undergo an EA. As of last Friday, they told us that we are. Meanwhile we're continuing to do our baseline studies of what's in the environment now. The collecting of data so we can measure what impacts we may have. Once we're into the pre-Environmental Assessment application, working groups will be set up including communities and First Nations in particular to help identify the valued components, those things that we have learned from the community and your input that we must spend most of our time studying. We'll write this up and apply. It'll be a large document, as you all know, binders and binders of documents. We're hoping for our EA approval sometime in 2015. This is based on the timeframes that we have been given from the regulators. And then site construction will go from there and then hopefully, from our perspective, we'll see operation begin in 2017. So that's a rough schedule of how we see things laying out. That's what that page is.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Let's go to page 9 then I'll stop for questions.

C: *Byng Giraud:* In any situation we're talking about two things: the EA process; the impacts, what things could we be doing to have these mitigated? But then on the other hand, there are also benefits. These are some of the things that we've put on one page here, about the things we think we are actually bringing to the community: jobs – construction jobs, the operation jobs; things we're doing in the community in terms of legacy – we've talked about some of the remediation and work we do on site in terms of the environment; for example, we think we can minimize visual impact, improve visual impact frankly, given what's there now; and then of course the broader economic benefits. So this is our proposal in terms of things that we think we can bring as an advantage.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Any questions or comments there?

Q: *Linda Olivier:* For the jobs, it says 100 full time jobs in shifts, for 25 years, why did you put the cap at only 25 years?

A: *Byng Giraud:* Because the export license we've been given by the Feds is only for 25 years. These facilities can last longer than that but I can't really plan beyond that.

Q: *Linda Olivier:* How many, for construction and some of the other jobs, do you think you will be using the option of employee workers from offshore and paying them less than the going rate? I think you can go up to 15% less.

A: *Byng Giraud:* I think the Feds are looking at that based on some things that we've all been reading in the paper. But our intention is to hire locally. It is in our interest to hire locally as much as possible. There are some certain types of expertise within this field that we might need to get some people from offshore to help us but we have an advantage over a lot of industrial projects you've been reading about in B.C., whether they are in LNG or mining or whatever – we are close to a large pool of labour. We have much greater access to this large pool of labour which is this city. Whereas places like Williams Lake don't have that. We don't see, given what we're talking about here, as many challenges. There will be some challenges, in terms of getting those operating jobs to all local people initially because you need on the job experience and there are very few LNG people in Canada. So we're in transition there. We're working with two post-secondary institutions – I don't want to name them, it wouldn't be fair – and the Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training, to look up curriculums to make sure that the people who are interested in this field can get the training that they need here so they can work not just at our facility but facilities up north.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Cheryl*: I have two questions for Reece. First of all, this particular floating type of situation, are you aware of this taking place elsewhere and you able to go and reference their findings as far as viability, the environmental effects?
- A: *Reece Fowler*: In terms of the floating platform I understand that this will be the first example of this in the world.
- A: *AG Gelotti*: This will be the first floating, or could be the first floating LNG liquefaction facility. As far as transferring cargo from one ship to another in a floating situation there are ship to ship transfers that happen now in the industry. That's something that's relatively new, it's just started to happen in the last few years but the technology and capability of transferring cargo from one ship to another while at sea is currently being done. There are also facilities where the ship is moored to a floating storage and then offloaded into storage. It's the liquefaction part that's going to be a first.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: But why a floating facility?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: When we were looking at the optimum project to build, we're looking at it from an environmental perspective and the least amount of disruption to the existing environment; we're looking at it from the business perspective, in terms of the cost; and we're looking at it from the technology perspective, what's available. All those reasons, if you look at putting the facility on a floating platform versus on land, there is a much smaller foot print on land than you would have, had you built the facilities on the land. Whether we build on land or offshore, the elements are going to be modular made and are still going to have to be brought in on barge to access the site. So when looking at this particular configuration, if you look at the Project Description that was filed, there were two Project Descriptions: one was having the facility floating offshore and one was having the facility with a portion of the facility onshore. We're now in that early stage of looking at both approaches but our preference is leaning towards having it off shore.
- Q: *Cheryl*: I have a second part of my question if I could. My second question is also for Reece, it's regarding the emissions involved. Converting natural gas to liquid is an extremely energy intensive activity and I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, that recently our Premier amended B.C.'s *Clean Air Act* in order to omit LNG conversion emissions from being reportable, so my question to you is, as far as this environmental assessment, is the project going to be able omit these emissions from the assessment?
- A: *Reece Fowler*: In terms the assessment itself, we have to first understand what the scheme is going to be and as everyone has said so far we are still at quite an early stage in the process of are we using gas to power the site or are we using electricity, and some of those sorts of design decisions will help in the assessment itself. And this is obviously part of the purpose of today to understand what some of the concerns and risks are on the table that the local community have.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: But Reece I think the question was – what kind of analysis or reporting would the project do on emissions?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: What the Premier has done has allowed electricity to be generated by fossil fuels, whereas only a small percentage was allowed under the previous legislation. So, the EA, us having to assess GHGs and assess emissions, that hasn't gone away so we would still have to assess those things. But what she's done is, allowed particular facilities up north to operate on caps.
- Q: *Shellene Paull*: Apparently, with all of the licenses that have so far been approved, there is no way that we are going to meet our emission targets and so what I understand she has been able to do is exempt the LNG emissions in order that it looks better and there's some chance that come 2020 we will be able to meet those emission targets.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- C: *Judy Kirk*: I don't think these guys can answer that.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: There is a small piece we can answer. We will, regardless of what our emissions are, still be required to pay a carbon tax and we'll have to buy offsets for any emissions we do generate.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: Okay, so going back to the floating scenario. I'm just wondering if one of the considerations with the floating is that you don't pay as much taxes if it's on water as if it was on land?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: So let's get that answered. Are you considering floatation to minimize tax?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: No.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: I don't know too much about this process but for the industrial process that you are undertaking, does it use fresh water – that's the first part of the question and if it does use fresh water, is there a degree of contamination?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Does liquefaction use fresh water?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: We will need fresh water for many of our systems on board, including closed loop cooling systems. There is not a contamination of that water, but in any case we are regulated in any of our discharge by the authorities and we have to meet the standards.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: How much water are you using?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: At the moment I can't answer. We are right at the beginning of our design studies into our needs for our systems. So this is part of the design process that we are just entering into.
- Q: *Linda Olivier*: But you must be able to anticipate from looking at other LNG facilities? Is it water intensive, the liquefaction process? Are you anticipating drawing on a lot of fresh water? Also, where would that water be coming from?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: So in closed loop systems you first take in the fresh water, then you have what is a relatively small make up as you lose from the natural process of using it in the system. Because it's closed loop you are not drawing it in and discharging. We do, in fact, have more than one engineering option that we are studying. We do have creeks within our facility, which we have the right to use water from but we can also generate fresh water using very well-known systems, where we take salt water and we generate our own fresh water. At the moment I don't know which systems will be used. It will be part of the study and we welcome feedback for you to state your concerns.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson*: I have a question for Alex here. I understand there's not really much you can do about nitrous oxide, if you are burning anything because there is nitrogen in the air, it'll oxidize. But I've heard that a plant of this size could have sizeable impact on the airshed, could produce smog. And of course brown smog we all know in the Fraser Valley is all nitrous oxide and it fills the Fraser Valley and makes our eyes hurt and our lungs sore. I've heard it said that this would be a comparable amount of nitrous oxide compared to the amount of vehicles in the area. Do you have any idea of what magnitude of nitrous oxide this will be in a unit like vehicle equivalent comparison – like how many SUVs?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: I understand the question. We're in the very early process of the design and some of the major decisions on selection will affect that question. So, for example whether we select gas turbine drive or electric drive throughout the unit. So I don't think at this early stage, until we've been through more of the design process it's appropriate to comment.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Could you just give an estimate? Because the efficiency is really not going to change that much. So if it's 140 megawatts, you can calculate what that is in terms of emissions quite readily.
- A: *Alex Brigden:* We have indicated that we have undertaken and are undertaking a system impact study with BC Hydro, with respect to 140 megawatts as our maximum requirement, if we have electric drives. There would be a different power requirement if we use a combination of electric drives and gas turbine drives.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* At what stage would that be available? Are we talking months?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* This information would be available before the EA is submitted, we're talking in months.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* In the summer.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Do you have any idea of the size of the plant. As an expert, in number of tonnes or cubic meters or however you want to put it?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So Graham, you know what? I'm going to move on. It's a fair question, except that I think that Alex has been pretty clear that it's fairly early on and information like that will be available in the coming months.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* I'll just save the last bit of time here then, in the absence of an answer, I heard the comment that there will be 100 jobs. Well I know of about five or six marinas in Howe Sound that probably employ 100 jobs each if you consider shifts – you know you've got like five or six people working then you've got people shifting and all that, then you've got the seasonal workers and the tour guides and the charter operators – there's about five times as many jobs to do with fishing, whale watching, recreational use, boat rentals and all that sort of thing, I'd just like to make that sort of point that this is an order of magnitude we have to assess here. We have five times as many jobs from tourism, one aspect of tourism, on the level of kayak operators on Bowen Island and other operators in Howe Sound, it's a significant industry, that's of a higher benefit to Canadians as opposed to a Malaysian company which is exporting and not even employing Canadians to build the facilities – it's hiring people off shore to build the facilities.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* I think you may be making some assumptions. All I can say is what we have. We have 100 jobs, maybe they are not as many as in the boating industry but we have 100 jobs that will be clean, well paid community jobs that will be supporting that community, which has a large commuting population that's lost its industrial base.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* But those jobs will affect the other jobs that already exist.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* I guess this is the point and it's a fundamentally philosophical point. I'm a British Columbian, I've lived here all my life I don't believe that industry and tourism are necessarily incompatible. And frankly one industry fuels the other. A lot of tourists have other jobs doing something else. Frankly, if you look around this Province there are places where we can work together.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* That might be true if you made a commitment to build on land and not build on water. All the marine life will be lost...
- C: *Byng Giraud:* Well that's good to hear.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Okay hang on, Graham, point made. I'm moving to Mona.
- Q: *Mona Benge:* Well I had the water question. You answered that already. Back at the tankers. When the LNG is transferred in to the tanker. What we need to think about as a community is, they are not your tankers right? They belong to other companies?

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- A: *Alex Brigden*: That is correct. Our intention would be to use or charter tankers via an existing shipping company that has an international reputation and experience with operating these type of tankers.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: So are they responsible for the product once it is on the ship?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: So who is responsible for once the product is on the ship?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: The responsibility for the product lies with the owner of the product. So it's the same as in the oil industry, so, if there's an oil spill and there's a requirement to clean, then that's the responsibility of the owner of the product. However LNG is non-toxic, non-polluting and it evaporates, it's lighter than water and it will evaporate so in terms of pollution, in the event of a spill, there will be no residual pollution.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: Now, what I'm still not clear on, we've watched on TV the huge fireball, from the leak in a pipeline that exploded, what is the danger that we have to think about in our Howe Sound?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: So does it, for example, burn or explode? What happens to it?
- Q: *Mona Benge*: I don't understand the scientific explanation. I've read a bit about it but I don't understand. Because it can drift and it can explode somewhere else, depend on where the winds take it.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Yep. Good question.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: I'll let the science guys get into the depth of it. Because I think you and I have the same question. This is how I understand it. First you have to have a rupture. You have to have that event. Then the gas would have to be contained in some way, that's the second event. The third thing that has to happen is there has to be a particular mix with the air. And AG can give you more specifics on that. So you need that specific thing and then you need the fourth event of ignition. You need those four specific things to happen in succession. So people may say, "Well it could happen, all things are possible" and I don't want to diminish that. But all I can point to, in terms of comfort, all I can point to is that these vessels have been running since 1964 and it has not happened.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: It's not just the vessels right? It's the plant too.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: It hasn't happened since 1964 and there are studies out there that show extreme event but those are studies where people are trying to anticipate an extreme event.
- C: *Graham Parkinson*: Because it hasn't happened, you are speculating that it won't happen, just as Alex said.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: All that anyone can do in life frankly is look at...
- C: *Mona Benge*: What we have to think about, as people that live here is: what is the worst case scenario?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Fair enough, Mona.
- C: *Gelotti*: Let me just make one other point. There is a difference between what is going on in a pipeline rupture and what you saw happen in Manitoba with the fire there. You have natural gas and the gas is in a pipeline under pressure, if you damage the pipeline – and sometimes when they are using a backhoe and they are digging sometimes they will damage a pipeline, not only are they rupturing the pipeline and allowing that gas under pressure to come out but they have also created an ignition source by the striking of steel on steel. With the LNG, methane gas in liquid form, can't burn. As I mentioned to you earlier if there was a spill, the methane gas would rise and disperse. In this very narrow band of having the gas and air in the right proportions, it's a very narrow band. Plus you'd have to have the ignition source. So as it's rising and getting further and further away

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

there is less likelihood of their being a source of ignition.

- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* I have two quick questions. In terms of responsibility, it was mentioned that the buyer is responsible, so that means that once LNG is loaded into these tankers it now belongs to the people who have bought it – and so, it is not the responsibility of anyone’s here?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Here’s what happens. When you are selling LNG, you can sell it “Free on Board”, which is referred to as FOB. If you go online and you Google Incoterms, Incoterms are the standard reference terms in shipping trade. Cost, Insurance and Freight (CIF), Free on Board (FOB) – you have all of these different classifications. The two primary ones are: FOB (Free On Board) – and the way the contracts are written, when the buyer is buying a cargo of LNG and if they have chartered the ship to transport that LNG, the ship providing the transportation service, the buyer becomes the shipper, the seller of the LNG is the seller. So as they load the ship, there’s a flange connection where the flange from the storage facility connects to the flange on the ship and there’s a meter there and as the LNG crosses that meter it measures how much LNG has gone on to the ship and once you do that, title from the LNG transfers from the seller to the buyer. Now the transporter, has Protection and Indemnity (P&I) insurance. So in the shipping industry, you have what’s called the P&I club. They have P&I charts. The charter of the ship has Charter’s Liability Insurance. And then there’s supplemental marine insurance which goes along with the movement of these cargos by ship. And this is all part of the standards in the industry that Alex was referring to for the movement of LNG and the transportation of it.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* I am curious why you prefer to have facility floating or on land? You talk about a footprint but it’s a very decided and dramatic footprint for the ocean mammals in the water.
- A: *AG Gelotti:* As I mentioned in project description, we have two descriptions: one with liquefaction facilities completely offshore, nothing on the land and then one on the land. Because we are still studying both of those approaches. Right now our preference is to put it floating.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* Why?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* One of the benefits of the floating unit is the control of the construction. So if we construct the unit in its entirety as a floating unit, we can construct in a construction facility which can take care of all those aspects, it’s already a purpose-built construction facility, we can control very closely, the quality, that we meet the regulatory standards and we can undertake testing at that facility.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* Why is it easier on the water?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* Because we then finish the unit in one single place and test in one place.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson:* So it’s cheaper?
- A: *Alex Brigden:* It’s not necessarily cheaper.
- A: *AG Gelotti:* If you are having the same contractor building the entire facility, in one location, they are doing all of the piping, all of the welding, all of the various pieces, and you are having everything manufactured and put together in one yard, by one contractor, you have much better control over the quality of the product. If you are doing that, the integrity of that facility will be much better than if you had, like Lego blocks, you build sections of it at other places and then you brought it to the site and you started to piece it together there.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Laurie Parkison:* Well it probably depends on who is hired to put it together. We really care about the natural world here and the ocean and all these marine mammals, not just going someplace else just because it's harder to put things together on land.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* You know what, I hear that loud and clear, and we've got it in the record and I'm going to come to you, Bernie, you've been very patient, and then Byng, I'd like to you to move to pages 10 and 11.
- Q: *Bernie:* I want to go back to the question of titles as far as the Project is concerned. Considering what we have seen happen in the Lac-Mégantic exercise, we have a carrier there and only have \$25 million worth of coverage for a \$200 million, at least, problem. What guarantee do we have, considering that as soon as that connection is made and gasoline is on that ship, you have no more interest in it, we now have to chase owners who are from other companies in Singapore and Japan and around the world – what assurance do we have that there is a enough liability insurance, if there is a problem here?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Well the industry does set standards for the amount of insurance coverage.
- C: *Bernie:* But it was inadequate in Lac-Mégantic. The amount of coverage was approved by the Federal Government for Lac-Mégantic.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So let him answer and then, I'll let you come back. How about that? So what guarantee, or what protection do people have, that the buyers of this LNG would have appropriate insurance?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Well there are industry standards within the LNG business. In terms of the type of Marine Insurance, P&I insurance, Charters Liability insurance, that each of the parties are required to carry. And to the extent that there are regulatory rules in British Columbia and Canada in terms of what levels of insurance we need to carry, we're certainly going to comply with that.
- C: *Bernie:* But in terms of what we've seen so far, it's been inadequate.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I hear you, sir. And what I would say to everyone here, if that is a concern from some or many, I would put it under the additional comments section because this, too, is an area that wasn't asked, and I would make sure that both the Canadian Environment Assessment Agency and BC Environment Assessment Office knew of that concern.
- I'm going to ask Byng please to continue on, with 10 and 11.
- C: *Byng Giraud:* So on page 10, we start to get into prompts for consultation topics – things we would like to hear more about. Again this is because we're at an early stage. I know you've heard that a lot tonight and maybe that's a little frustrating but we want to get your input on these things. Are we doing the right things? So on page 10, these are the studies we are typically asked to do in an EA. So is the list sufficient? Are there areas not listed here you think we should focus on? Are there areas that we shouldn't be focusing on? So this is our first consultation topic. This is where some of the topics I've heard today are really helpful because I have heard about acoustics with marine mammals, we've heard about floating versus land and this is related to that as well, and I've heard about fresh water and I've heard about failure effects analysis, so I've heard about those things and so those are some of the comments I already have toward this topic but when you look at this, this is the sort of template list that we get when we go into this process. Is it sufficient, do we need more? Are there things on here that if you had to pick your topic, what would it be? That sort of thing. That's what we're looking for input on in this topic.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Moving to 11.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- C: *Byng Giraud*: This is somewhat related. Page 10 was the socio-economic, the socio-community and environment assessment. In addition to that, we have to do a bunch of engineering work. It's regulated but it's not part of the EA as much. So things that, we've heard about the transportation of LNG tonight, that's a big issue and our use of the TERMPOL process. TERMPOL is a voluntary process. And we've heard loud and clear tonight that that is something we'll have to take really seriously. So those are some of the things that maybe outside the typical studies of EA. What would you like to see more of, did we miss something? Or are these things sufficient? Is there something that we've said we're going to be doing that you don't think is important? As we get in to the working group and start selecting the value components – what has to be assessed by the regulators and by the community and by the First Nations, it's important that we are actually looking at the right things and the things that are important to you. So those are our two consultation topics. You might want to come online and leave us some notes afterwards if you can't think of everything you want to comment on today.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm going to ask Byng to go on to the next page and then I'll pause because that's our third consultation topic.
- C: *Byng Giraud*: So this is something that's come up in some of our earlier discussions. We haven't done formal consultation like this yet, we've been in the communities just talking to people, talking to First Nations, and this has come up time and time again. Another topic that we thought we would ask people about, particularly people that use the area recreationally, is, historically there hasn't been access to the back country and I guess up to Mount Sedgwick, there are elk herds up there, the First Nations have told us, and there's a lot of hiking and recreational activities so this seems to come up a lot and so, is this something that's important? Something that we can do perhaps to be a better member of the community.
- Those three topics we thought of that you might like to give us more input on. They are not exhaustive or conclusive. They are the prompts.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson*: If this facility happens you will have to power it by natural gas or electricity. If you end up powering the facility by electricity or a combination, my concern is, with higher demand for electricity in the area that our electricity rates will go up. Is there any way where you who are increasing the cost will bear the brunt of higher electricity prices and our prices would stay the same?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: That's a very good question, in terms of understanding. So we are doing the system impact study to find out what our impact would be on the system – I think it's not simply the physical impact on the infrastructure that's out there now but on the greater grid.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: What would your demand do?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: So that study is underway. Secondly, good question, what happens? So any infrastructure we have to build, this system impact study said you have to build some redundancies, some additional transmissions, some power lines, anything, we pay for that. So say we had to build some additional infrastructure, some power lines... say BC Hydro had to build some additional 'stuff', for lack of a better term, we have to pay for that. That's typical in B.C. now. In addition to that, and it's being worked out, we will be given a tariff to make sure cover any additional stress on the system. Our tariff will be different from yours.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson*: Is that normal for industry?

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- A: *Byng Giraud*: It's a highly regulated industry. I'm familiar with the power line in the north west from a previous job so there was a special tariff for industry that they had to pay to cover the costs, not only did they have to pay to build the line, they had to pay to cover those additional costs. There was no impact to on local rates for residents. And Megan might correct me, but as far as I understand, because this will have to go to the BC Utilities Commission, there's no impact on ratepayers.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: Megan do you have anything to add?
- A: *Megan Harris*: No, that is correct.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: If you have, or anyone has additional questions on the same subject, you may like to direct them to BC Hydro, as well, since these guys really can't speak for BC Hydro.
- Q: *Cheryl*: Just while we are on this BC Hydro topic and LNG in general, understanding the liquefaction process is energy intensive, and this project is smaller than those going on up north, I understand the question is, where is this extra energy going to come from? To liquefy natural gas, it's a ton of energy that's needed. Which is why this whole Site C dam, which is now under review, the real reason for building it is just to help to provide some of the power that will be needed for LNG. It's not for housing, it's not for us, it's not residential use at all. So on a smaller scale but in the same realm, if you went ahead and used BC Hydro for it, that would be taking power, as Laurie says, would be taking power, which is a Crown corporation, I don't know if we would end up paying for, for any infrastructure that might be needed to access your plan but certainly in the long run, the overall supply of Hydro to the Province is going to be severely taxed by the presence of LNG in B.C.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: I guess I can't speak to the larger part and I can't speak to all the inner workings of BC Hydro but we did look at their recent rate review. There was 90 megawatts (MW) being used by the pulp mill in the past, so there was considerable consumption there. So incrementally, we're not adding a lot. Possibly 140 MW. So there is some additional use. Is that something that can be supplied within the system? According to what we understand from BC Hydro, yes, that could be supplied within the existing system. If you add all the big projects together? I'm not really in a position to comment on that.
- Q: *Cheryl*: Is that a similar amount – the 90 MW? Is that similar to what you would use?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: 90 MW is what it was, and we would use about 140 MW.
- Q: *Bruce*: My question is to the environmental nature of the site. With 70 years of industry use, a big sludge pond up the back, in an effort to remediate the site, any disturbance of the site would likely breach environmental containment that's there. Has this been part of your decision to go offshore with the floating components of your facility?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: No, but I'll speak to what's up there right now. And yes, there's 100 years of industrial activity, there are some things that need to be cleaned up, there's nothing that has been capped or contained at this point. That's what we're paying for. That's what we're doing right now. So our use of the site or disturbance of the site, what our intention is to do is to cap, close it and resolve as much of it as possible because none of that has been done yet.
- Q: *Bruce*: But in terms of your construction, my question is to your choice of placing your facility in the water, is it a function of not wanting to disturb the contaminated site?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: It's not directly. But we would have to, in any construction we do on the site, be aware of the Certificate of Compliance and what uses it allows. So if a place was capped, it's not capped now, and in the future we had to use that spot, we would have to get permits from the

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Ministry of Environment to disturb that site. And when it was closed later, you'd have to get a new Certificate of Compliance.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* But the bottom line question that Bruce is asking is: Is your decision to prefer the floating site, and I've heard you say that it's a preference because it's not decided yet, is it because of the existence of the existing contamination? Is that why there is a preference? I'm trying to simplify things for the record and so people can understand it.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* Was it a consideration? The answer would be yes.
- Q: *Linda Olivier:* I have read that with the oil industry, carriers have avoided paying compensation after any spills by registering their ships in Liberia and Marshall Islands. What is the distance between where the ships will be and the railway and the Highway?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* So the closest point you can actually see is from Britannia. From there, the road and rail you can see it right there in Britannia. And it's 5.5kms.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I think that your question is: As the ship is going down Howe Sound, how close to the ship is the railway going along and the road?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* Don't know the exact information.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Perhaps Mr. Gelotti could give us a bit of background on the Corporate structure of Woodfibre LNG and the parent corporation because all we've heard are articles in the paper that say things like it's a project of a Malaysian billionaire who got a project together for her son to see what he could do and so started a Canadian subsidiary. My question is, is there anywhere in this chain a public company in which we can go and look up the financial statements, what the business model is, look at the business plan, look at the tariffs that are assumed, look at the chain of responsibility and that sort of thing. Is there a public company in this chain?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Not to my knowledge.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* Could you just explain what the corporate structure is – who is the majority shareholder of Woodfibre LNG.
- A: *AG Gelotti:* There is a sole proprietor – Mr. Tanoto, who owns all the businesses within the conglomerate or portfolio of companies that they have. One of those businesses is Pacific Oil & Gas and they are in the oil and gas industry in Indonesia and Mr. Tanoto is wanting to expand his business from the oil and gas industry into the LNG sector. It is his daughter, and not his son, who is now going to head up the LNG side of business. He has a company called RGE – I think if you Google Royal Golden Eagle, you'll be able to see the RGE company – it's a company that manages all of his various businesses. He has businesses in pulp and paper in Indonesia and Brazil. And he has the oil and gas production in Indonesia. He has palm oil business and power generation in China. He owns interest in an LNG receiving terminal in China. So he is the sole proprietor.
- Q: *Graham Parkinson:* So no Canadian Shareholders?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* The Woodfibre Natural Gas is a registered Canadian company, but again solely owned by Mr. Tanoto.
- C: *Byng Giraud:* Just a minor point, he's of Indonesian descent. He's Chinese descent Indonesian, based in Singapore.
- C: *Graham Parkinson:* I appreciate the clarification.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Mona Benge*: With the tankers again, because we don't have a sense of the route, or I don't, it's going to pass a lot of different communities. Do you have a responsibility to have a similar consultation with all of those different communities?
- A: *Byng Giraud*: Our intent is to consult as much as possible within the context of the EA. We think this is as far south as the Agency is going to ask us but because we are not in the process yet they haven't told us. So we've got a meeting in Whistler, partially because people are concerned about the airshed, and we've got a meeting in Britannia next week and, we don't have a meeting in Lions Bay because we couldn't find a room. So there are some logistical issues there.  
So yes.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: I was just thinking if you were consulting the people in the Gulf Islands and Vancouver Islands that you'll be passing going out to the ocean.
- A: *Byng Giraud*: We won't be consulting outside of Howe Sound. Partially because as soon as we get out of the Howe Sound there is 14,000 ship movements, so the EAO would probably see that as something that they need to do to from maybe more of the cumulative effects from some of the larger projects.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: That said, one of the beauties of online feedback forms is that if people in the Gulf Islands felt that they had an interest, or concern, they could fill out that feedback form. It doesn't say you have to be a resident of Squamish or Lions Bay or Britannia Beach and that is true of the BC EAO process – they take written submissions from all over the province – and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency process as well.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: If you have this floating gizmo, how is it stabilized? You know how with movement, like I know just with the ferry traffic, I live above Horseshoe Bay and you get rattling of windows, you know, just from the vibration. So if you are on the water and there is really rough water up there...
- A: *Alex Brigden*: So again, we're at the very early stages of the design process but the size of the foundation facility, which will be a barge, the size and the shape, it will not be significantly affected by the size and the wave length of the waves that we experience in the area. However, the equipment that will be placed on that barge will be designed to be able to operate with the movements that would be found from environmental impact on the barge. So any wave that makes the barge move, it would be able to operate safely.
- Q: *Mona Benge*: So it doesn't have things that are underneath it that goes down to the dirt to hold it up? So it's free floating?
- A: *Alex Brigden*: It is free floating but it is moored. So it can't float away from the jetty. It is moored to the jetty but it will not be stabilized from a fixed mechanism to the sea bed.
- Q: *Byng Giraud*: This is being taken very seriously in some of the studies that we are doing right now. For example, we are looking under the water, because the sound even under the water is quite steep about under water avalanches that could cause an extreme event under water. So we have started some of those analyses.
- Q: *Dave Patrick*: Alex, with all due respect, on Mona's point on BC Ferries, we heard the same thing about the Coastal Renaissance. It's moored too, and houses shake and lights flash. I don't know if you can guarantee there will not be disruption to people's homes and artifacts. Because I have heard lots and lots of complaints over the years of people's lights being rattled, glasses being shattered by the Coastal Renaissance. It's eased up a bit now they've done all sorts of work with the ferries. But you can't guarantee that.

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Q: *Bruce:* I'd like to follow up on my question about the site and its environmental contamination. It's a very contaminated site. If you were to build on land, you'd have to disturb the land. And is your concern that you would carry a liability long term if you were to build on land?
- A: *Byng Giraud:* When we take over the site we will own it. And we will carry the long-term liability.
- Q: *Bruce:* But disturbance of the land would cause contaminant to enter Howe Sound for decades and probably longer, so your preference is automatically to float your...
- A: *Byng Giraud:* There are some things we're going to have to carry regardless. For example the main landfill is not properly underlined and there is water treatment taking place there right now. So we're basically going to be assuming liabilities that we know that are already there.
- C: *Bruce:* So it's cheaper in the long run to build offshore rather than...
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Sir, you're asserting that.
- C: *Bruce:* I'm asking a question... if that's your assumption, that's up to you.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Well I've heard you ask it in two or three different ways.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* I mean the polluted site is a factor of construction, I wouldn't say it's necessarily cheaper. We're assuming a liability in perpetuity, frankly, for the environmental remediation of the site. We could be running that water treatment facility forever. And my point is, only a company of this size could carry that liability.
- Q: *Bruce:* Could building on the land disturb the site and cause greater liability?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Could building on the land disturb the site? Yes.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* Could it cause greater liability than the one we are assuming? I don't know.
- Q: *Cheryl:* So this is a very large business owner, he's a big fish, this guy that owns this company, among many other companies. If things go well, it's approved and it's built and we're seeing this certain amount of traffic in Howe Sound, is it foreseeable that he might decide to expand his operation and become a much bigger operation?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* Here in Howe Sound, with the current pipeline capacity...
- C: *Cheryl:* It's being expanded now...
- A: *AG Gelotti:* When it's expanded, that's the maximum amount of expansion, so it's limited by the amount of gas that you can actually get to the liquefaction facility.
- A: *Byng Giraud:* There's a bottleneck.
- Q: *Cheryl:* And just another question on the gas. How much of the gas that's used will be conventional and how much is from fracking?
- A: *AG Gelotti:* We will be getting gas on the open market. We will be buying gas from sellers of natural gas on the pipeline system, in the open market. For us to determine how much of it is coming from conventional gas supply to unconventional gas supply, there's no way for us to really know that.
- Q: *Eoin Finn:* I understand a little bit of the business economics of LNG and I understand that this rush to export LNG from Canada is based on the difference between the spot price and the long term contract price in Asia. And as I understand it, from such an odd source as the Canada West Foundation who has just published a report that says "Dear B.C., if you think you are going to make a fortune out of this, I've got news for you"... I'm summarizing. Two questions: Do you think that? And the second one is: Is any of the motivation for placing stuff on the ocean, rather than on land, that it will make it easier to pick up sticks and leave if that happens?

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- A: *Byng Giraud*: Let me talk to the Canada West Foundation one first because I've read the report. There are different versions of how this market will evolve and what's going to happen in the future. Some people have bigger ideas of what a bonanza this is going to be for British Columbia and some people have smaller ideas. Those are really public policy discussions. We think as a company we can build this, be successful, we can make some money out of it, we can make a contribution to the community. We don't think about the larger issue of what the Premier does or doesn't think she needs to bring in. We do know there will be a tax. They haven't given it to us yet.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: What about Part B? The floating aspect. Does that allow you to leave more easily?
- A: *AG Gelotti*: The floating aspect of it, certainly makes it mobile, so if at some point in the future you wanted to dismantle the facility and remove it, you could more easily do that because it's floating. The intent here, there is such an investment being made in the actual facility itself and a commitment contractually, to BC Hydro and FortisBC for pipeline services, that it's not in our best interest to pack up and go. It's in our best interest to operate this facility for the 25 years or more that we have the license to export the LNG.
- I'd like to add just one thing. The facilities are designed very specifically around the type and chemical properties of the gas we receive. So to be able to relocate a facility to another location may not be as easy as it may appear, just because it's floating because the pre-treatment facilities, the liquefaction facilities are designed specifically for the chemical composition, the amount of gas we receive.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: So you just can't up and leave.
- Q: *Laurie Parkinson*: I have just one quick thing. I want to thank you for being here tonight. We really appreciate this session. It was a challenge to get to this session this early. I imagine a lot of people couldn't come to it because of that. I think with this being a huge area for recreation, there are lots of people who would highly appreciate a session in Vancouver.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: If you and others feel like that is quite important, I would encourage you to let the BC EAO know, because really it's within the regulatory framework that they would determine which communities open houses should be in.
- C: *Byng Giraud*: Page 18 is about how you want to be consulted. There are comments at the bottom and there are those who would prefer to be consulted like this...
- C: *Laurie Parkinson*: Because it's much easier to do this than read all this online.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Fair enough, that's why we're doing this.

### 3. CLOSING REMARKS

- C: *Byng Giraud*: Thank you very much. It's a big chunk of people's time. I want to apologize on some levels for how preliminary it is. I'm always sort of torn about how soon do you go out because you don't have a lot of information and if you go out too late you have too much and people are like "why didn't you talk to me sooner?" So I'm always in that little dilemma and I appreciate your patience with that. Thanks for coming out. There will be more sessions. There will be future rounds. This community will be included. It is very critical for us to get this input at this stage. We need to know what we should be focusing on. And I've heard some very clear things here. Thanks

<b>MEETING DETAILS</b>	<b>Woodfibre LNG Project – Community Consultation, February 2014</b> West Vancouver Small Group Meeting February 4, 2014, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Gleneagles Golf Course and Clubhouse West Vancouver, BC
------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

for your input, thanks for your time. If you need to get in touch with us, our email and website has been provided to you, it's all in the document.

Q: *Laurie Parkinson*: For the future sessions will you send us an email?

C: *Judy Kirk*: Did you sign up when you came in? Did you provide your email address? Then the answer to that is yes.