

Public Consultation Period – Comments from Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)

Project: Cedar LNG

Date: April 2nd, 2025

Author (Name, Title): James Dwyer, Senior Biologist, Fish and Fish Habitat Protection Program

#	Document	Page, Section	Original text	Modification suggested	Comments
1	Draft Report <i>Analysis of Proposed Changes to the Cedar LNG Project</i> (IAAC, 2025)	Page 10 Section 4.1.2 Freshwater fish and their habitat	DFO also recommended that the Proponent verify the calculation of riparian clearing in the Riparian Management Area around fish-bearing watercourses, as <u>the data does not seem to be consistent (1).</u>	1) DFO also recommended that the Proponent verify the calculation of riparian clearing in the Riparian Management Area around fish-bearing watercourses, as <u>the data provided in the Proponent's Amendment Application did not appear to be consistent.</u>	-
2	idem	Page 10-11 Section 4.1.2 Freshwater fish and their habitat	DFO also asked for more information regarding the fish species present in Beaver Creek and the tributary to Douglas Channel (a new fish-bearing Project crossing in the Amendment Application) where the alternative transmission line and distribution powerline intersect the watercourses. The Proponent responded that the main channel of Beaver Creek is not crossed by the Project and that <u>there are barriers to fish passage downstream of Project crossing (1), thus concluding that <u>anadromous fish species are not expected to be present in proximity to the Project crossing's locations (2). However (3),</u></u> DFO highlighted that the Proponent's	-	1) The Proponent responses to DFO IR #003 do not indicate a downstream barrier on Beaver Creek. This sentence might be referring to the tributary to Douglas Channel. 2) The Proponent's response to DFO IR #003 confirmed that coho salmon have been previously documented approx. 250 m upstream of T-01.2-2 crossing (which means they would be present at the crossing) and coho salmon have been captured in proximity to the T-01.2-1 crossing

			<p>Amendment Application indicates that coho salmon have been observed in proximity to a Project crossing that is included in the Amendment Application. Therefore, DFO recommended that the Proponent verify the fish-bearing status of watercourse WC-14 during construction planning. The Proponent responded that field work in October and November 2024 <u>already confirmed that WC-14 was not fish-bearing (4)</u>. Additionally, this status is not expected to change because there are four major obstacles (gradient barriers extending from 40% to 60%) preventing fish from moving upstream to WC-14.</p>		<p>3) There were two watercourses discussed in the DFO IR #003: Beaver Creek and the tributary to Douglas Channel (aka WC-14). The first part of this paragraph should address Beaver Creek followed by the tributary to Douglas Channel.</p> <p>Beaver Creek: Based on the Proponent's response, there are likely coho and other species at or within proximity of the Beaver Cr crossings, T-01.2-2 and T-01.2-1.</p> <p>Trib to Douglas Channel (WC-14): Although the Proponent's Amendment Application indicated coho presence at both the DL-14 and T-14 crossings, recent fieldwork conducted in October and November 2024 confirmed that the WC-14 is not fish-bearing above the fish barriers, located immediately upstream of the Bish Creek Forest Service Road. This means there are no fish at T-14 crossing, but fish present at DL-14 and may include coho salmon.</p> <p>4) Note that WC-14 is the Proponent-given name of the whole watercourse, and Stantec's February 12, 2025, memo regarding WC-14 classification update states that "downstream of barriers, WC-14 is fish-bearing and supports juvenile coho salmon"</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

3	idem	Page 11 Section 4.1.2 Marine Resources	The Proponent committed to implementing mitigations measures and to monitoring underwater noise during pile driving, adjusting methods or adding mitigations if levels exceed <u>160 decibels (1)</u> .	1) DFO understands the Proponent referenced the 160 dB threshold in their final response to DFO IR #006, but given there are three underwater noise thresholds in the Decision Statement, we recommend changing sentence to " <u>...if levels exceed underwater noise thresholds established in the Decision Statement.</u> "	-
4	idem	Page 11 Section 4.1.3 Freshwater fish and their habitat	IAAC is of the view that, while some riparian clearing will increase, the proposed changes are not expected to significantly impact freshwater fish, their habitat, or water quality, as no instream works, channel realignments, or water withdrawals <u>would occur (1)</u> .	1) Recommend adding to end of sentence: " <u>... in fish-bearing watercourses.</u> "	-