From: Sandra Leckie <email address removed>
Sent: March 2, 2016 12:44 AM
To: Woodfibre LNG / GNL Woodfibre (CEAA/ACEE); ec.ministre-minister.ec@canada.ca; Pam.Goldsmith-Jones@parl.gc.ca; Dion, Stéphane: HOC; Jonathan.Wilkinson@parl.gc.ca; Trudeau, Justin: HOC
Subject: Woodfibre Liquified Natural Gas Project-Howe Sound, British Columbia

I oppose the Woodfibre LNG Project in Howe Sound, British Columbia. Some of my reasons for opposition are the following;

- The environmental costs of the project both locally and globally will outweigh any benefits.Damage to the local herring population,glass sponge reefs and sports fishing has not been addressed for this project. Health impacts and costs from release,of nitrous oxide and sulphur dioxide has not been addressed.

- Woodfibre LNG will emit about 1 million tonnes of GHGs per year - increasing Canada's overall GHG footprint at a time when GHG reduction is a pivotal commitment for Canada

  both at home and to meet global commitments

  .

- Canada's COP21 commitment to reduce GHG emissions will be compromised should the Woodfibre LNG project be approved.

Please accept my comment

s
on the analysis of the anticipated GHG emissions associated with the proposed Woodfibre Liquefied Natural Gas [LNG] Project in the Report named 'Woodfibre Liquefied Natural Gas [LNG] Project – Review of Related Upstream GHG Estimates'.

- The CEAA GHG *Report* dated February 1st

  fails to consider the negative environmental impact of fugitive methane gases

  .

  Recent peer reviewed scientific studies have highlighted the underestimation and the importance of fugitive methane gases in the overall GHG footprint of LNG projects.

- Also n

  ot factored into the CEAA GHG Report is the increasing GHG footprint and its associated environmental degradation

  concomitant

  with

  extracting more environmentally challenging Natural Gas resources over time.

- Current

  research identifies that the 100 year GWP [Global Warming Potential] factor used in the CEAA GHG *Report* is <u>out of date</u>. A more valid measure is

  a

  much larger 20 year GWP factor supported by science.

- Inconsistent with current practice is the assumption of a 75%:25% BC:Alberta proportion of source gas. This underestimates the resulting GHG emissions.
- The

  CEAA GHG *Report* suggests that *Carbon Capture and Storage [CCS]* is imminent

  and yet gives no substantive evidence to back up this assumption.

  To date, the economics and technologies of CCS have proven

  uneconomic and are not industry standard.

Sincerely,
Sandra Leckie

All scientific work is incomplete – whether it be observational or experimental. All scientific work is liable to be upset or modified by advancing knowledge. That does not confer upon us a freedom to ignore the knowledge we already have, or to postpone the action that it appears to demand at a given time. (Sir Austin Bradford Hill, 19