

Proposed Information Requests on the Sufficiency and Technical Merit of the Environmental Assessment

Participant: John Yanota, Coleman, Alberta

Organization (if applicable): Self

General Comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the Grassy Mountain EIA Addendum 11. The sheer volume of contributions by all interested parties confirm the importance of the project and the how much that those impacted care deeply that the project, if in the best interest of the majority would be implemented in a socially responsible manner.

Further, I'd like to commend all those that have contributed to date, especially those who provided input into the environmental, technical, financial and social impacts for it is this input that will ensure this project, should it proceed to final operation be done in a responsible and sustainable manner consistent with the values of Canadians, Albertans and Crowsnest Pass residents now and in the future.

I have read a significant portion of the 277 pages of the body of Addendum 11 and referred to several of the Tables, Figures and Appendices dealing with issues I needed to understand in detail. I have yet to come upon any information that was inadequate or lacking or incomplete. In fact, there are many areas where the information is so extensive that it borders on "more confusing or in it's detail, buries the fundamental issue or concern. Having stated this, I am feel the information pertaining to the most important and impactful issues appears to be adequately addressed.

I do not take the EIA process lightly. I grew up in the Crowsnest Pass , moved away for 40 years and have returned to be a resident in Coleman. I regularly associate with over 80 other residents many that have lived in the Pass all their lives and have yet to find anyone that is not confident that the laws, bylaws, regulations and enforceable ordinances would ensure the protection of the natural surroundings. Then, in addition to the existing protective laws as they exist, the detailed studies that have been produced in the current and previous submissions re-confirm that this or any project that would be initiated in this area would be done so in a responsible and environmentally sustainable manner.

I'm sure it is understandable to everyone that, all traffic and development in an area will have some effect on the animals, plants, lands and humans. In the past 120 years the area has been home to over 20 coal mines. For 65 years I have either lived in the Crowsnest Pass or returned frequently to visit family. I've hiked, biked and camped in many areas North and South of Highway 3. In those 65 years the mining and environmental laws and regulations have evolved massively, continually improving to ensure nature and humans coexist in a responsible and sustainable way. Even though the laws and regulations of the past might have been rather poorly informed and less well studied the result after 120 years of mining, forestry, human traffic and natural disasters (fires, floods and rock slides) the area is host to a thriving abundance of wildlife and plant species. To the people not fully supportive of the resurrection of the old Grassy Mountain mine who wish to see today's environmental state as needing to be preserved it is worth pointing out that these conditions are the results much less

Proposed Information Requests on the Sufficiency and Technical Merit of the Environmental Assessment

stringent and poorly enforced regulatory system of the past. Maybe what this demonstrates is that industry and the public have worked as partners in the development and protection of our natural and built environment.

Going forward and respectful of 120 years of mining in the area and under the guidance of existing laws, bylaws, regulations and ordinances coupled with public scrutiny I believe that the potential that this development could have a significant negative environmental effect is extremely low and highly unlikely. Should there be some unforeseen action that creates some negative effect it would be identified and addressed in due course.

Further, those concerned with the potential for long-term negative effects must have on the other hand deep gratitude that as part of the project is the restoration of the existing old, mine workings to a state that blends in well with nature and wildlife at the end of the project whose state would not otherwise be restored.

From Addendum 11, Page 29 dealing with restoration of the existing mine workings:

“Incorporate the existing legacy mining disturbances into the development and reclamation plans for the project, and other proposed land use activities to the best extent possible so that habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, linear disturbance features, and cumulative habitat loss are minimized.”

I therefore find the sufficiency and technical merit of the EIA and related information from the proponent to be complete and comprehensive and fully satisfaction of the Terms or Reference.

I would like to see process proceed expeditiously toward the decision and hopefully, approval of the Grassy Mountain Coal Project as proposed.

John Yanota

<personal information removed>

Proposed Information Requests on the Sufficiency and Technical Merit of the Environmental Assessment

Proposed Information Requests on the Sufficiency and Technical Merit of the Environmental Assessment

Information Source <i>(section or page# of EIS, Addenda, Responses to Requests for Information, etc.)</i>	Rationale	Proposed Information Request

Proposed Information Requests on the Sufficiency and Technical Merit of the Environmental Assessment

Information Source <i>(section or page# of EIS, Addenda, Responses to Requests for Information, etc.)</i>	Rationale	Proposed Information Request
<i>Please use as many pages as necessary.</i>		