

From: <email address removed>
Sent: March 2, 2016 1:27 AM
To: Woodfibre LNG / GNL Woodfibre (CEAA/ACEE)
Subject: Woodfibre LNG

I live in <contact information removed> <personal information removed>

Cavalier.
Dismissive.
Undervalued.
Mis-calculated.
Contradictory.

The above words describe my disappointment and frustration when I consider how the provincial government and Woodfibre LNG have proceeded with the EA application for an LNG processing plant (and all that this entails such as pipelines and fracking and all other activities in between) and subsequent tanker traffic to export this product.

Safety: This project dismisses and does not attach adequate value to the lives and safety of the ever-increasing population and traffic through the area of Howe Sound. At this time, there exists no federal or provincial marine safety regulations that will adequately protect and prevent a catastrophic event. Woodfibre LNG dismisses safety concerns when presenting historical safety records: there have been almost no explosions, thus, ergo, how could there be any in the future? Howe Sound is greatly affected by strong winds and weather in the fall and winter, as well as this area is located in an earth quake zone. How can any person or group predict a future without accidents caused by natural disasters or human error? And how does the proponent address the safety of other marine traffic in narrow area of the inlet during transport of LNG to the open ocean beyond the Juan de Fuca Strait? Has this yet been identified? or quantified?

Contradictory: The recent success of marketing the Sea-to-Sky highway to the world and the relatively recently-arrived prospect of a recreation industry with hundreds of families re-locating to Squamish appears to have been undervalued by a provincial government intent on a large and as-yet-unregulated return to large and carbon-emission-producing industry in Howe Sound. Are we being asked to ignore the unique natural beauty of this inlet that has been recently heralded by the Economist journal and the New York Times as one of the most gorgeous and wild areas that lays only 30 minutes from a downtown urban area? in order to provide a greener fuel that we can provide to Asia? Can anyone welcome a view of methane-spewing stacks while driving up the Sea-to-Sky highway? (considered by international acclaim to be one of the best drives in the world). The recent fluctuations of our world economy also underscores the contradiction of a project that will change the face of this inlet forever, in exchange for an uncertain economic gain during a time when carbon emissions grow increasingly 'unfashionable'?

Dismissive: This project dismisses those who are concerned about safety to humans (LNG processing and transport) as well as the environmental threats to all marine life. There are so many factors that have been identified. I will not list them here, as you are already aware of them.

Mis-calculated. Can one mis-calculate the economic value of a child's first sight of a whale? Does any adult ever forget their first whale? How have the promoters of this project in this location not considered the increasing population and a need for a recreational area close to our growing urban area. There is an incalculable price placed on this experience, Why is this and the many other 'first-time' experiences to be had in Howe Sound weighted with less economic return than that of a fuel that is quickly losing it's value?

Undervalued: the future of families, their children and grandchildren to enjoy Howe Sound as a close, natural diamond that exists literally right around the corner from Lighthouse Park will be thrown away for

a short-term profit. I am convinced that an approval of this project will clearly expose a paucity of foresight and concern for BC citizens' futures.

This Woodfibre project has no social license. There are many more factors too numerous to list here. I fear that due diligence will be sacrificed for a short-term result. I fear that a fast decision will be made in the interest of too few of the citizens of BC. I see a decision for this project represents the methods of a cavalier approval system that does not value my contribution.

Please consider my comments.

B.E. K. Grant
<contact information removed>, BC.